



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 24, 2014

No. 117

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 24, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

AFGHAN SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to urge—indeed, to plead—with my colleagues to cosponsor bipartisan legislation that Representative KINZINGER and I will be introducing this afternoon, which would authorize 1,000 additional special immigrant visas to allow the United States to bring our Afghan allies to safety here in America. Earlier this week,

Senators MCCAIN and SHAHEEN introduced identical legislation in the other body.

The need for this bill is urgent. Indeed, Congress should have acted yesterday. That is because the State Department has confirmed now that they have completely run out of the visas we authorized in December. In a way, that is good news.

Remember how in previous years the State and other agencies never remotely came close to using the visas that were authorized, which consigned these poor souls to the seventh circle of bureaucratic hell. Processing was so slow and abysmal that only 32 of our Afghan allies received a visa in 2012. People were left in limbo—or worse—while the Taliban hunted them down, kidnapped their siblings, murdered their parents—capturing them, torturing, beheading them.

But the administration responded to the demand from Congress for significant reform in the program, and the agency has aggressively attacked the visa-eligible backlog. Despite the processing—on average, 400 visas each month since January—years of a failed system means that, today, there remains an astonishing 6,340 brave men and women waiting in limbo.

If Congress does not act before we adjourn for the August recess, it means we will be slamming the door to safety for hundreds of our Afghan allies and their families. With each day that passes, these are people whose lives and those of their families are left to the tender mercies of the Taliban—seeking revenge.

Mr. Speaker, Representative KINZINGER and I have a nonpartisan, fully paid-for bill—House leadership willing—that could pass on the floor in the blink of an eye. All we have to do—what we must do—is choose to make it a priority. Remember, we have done this before. Reforms that enabled the program to work passed as an amend-

ment to the National Defense Authorization Act on this floor by, I found, an inspiring 420–3 margin. Passing this bill is not only the right thing to do for these poor souls, it is in our own national security interest.

As Secretary Kerry pointed out in urging Congress to grant more visas, “The way a country winds down a war in a faraway place and stands by those who risk their own safety to help us in the fight sends a powerful message to the world that is not soon forgotten.”

Whether or not you supported the wars in Iraq or Afghanistan, what matters now is where we stand in keeping our commitments. This bill, authorizing an additional 1,000 visas for the balance of this current fiscal year, is a Band-Aid—but a critical one. We are going to have to act again in the coming months to deal with fiscal year 2015, starting in October.

For too long, it was the State and other agencies that failed to make this the priority it needed to be. Now that they have upped the attention, the focus, the resources, and the commitment, let’s not let Congress be the obstacle. Innocent lives are at stake. American honor is on the line.

I urge my colleagues to do everything they can in the coming days to bring this bill to the floor. It is our duty to save the lives of those who risked so much to help us when we needed them.

HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week, the largest ever study of schizophrenia reported that the condition is tied to more than 100 genes.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6749

This discovery shows more evidence that schizophrenia is a clinical condition just like other medical conditions. Severe schizophrenia, therefore, must be treated with a medical approach, using evidence-based therapies that work.

We know 50 percent of persons with schizophrenia suffer from a neurological impairment that makes them incapable of understanding that they are ill. This lack of awareness, termed "anosognosia," is the leading cause of noncompliance with psychiatric treatment. This neurological problem helps to explain why 40 percent of Americans with a serious mental illness do not receive treatment, and it explains how our system fails to help those most in need.

Anosognosia occurs most frequently when schizophrenia or a bipolar disorder affects portions of the frontal lobe, resulting in impaired executive function. The patients are neurologically unable to comprehend that their delusions or hallucinations are not real. This is different than denial; this is a change in the wiring of the brain. These individuals don't recognize they are ill. When they don't meet the 200-year-old definition of being in imminent danger to harm themselves or others, their friends and families are powerless to help them. Uninformed observers wrongly believe that, because the patients can look at them and talk to them, they must be fully functional and aware, but they are not.

Much like if they had Alzheimer's disease or were in a coma, these individuals with schizophrenia can't voluntarily request treatment on their own. We would never deny care to a stroke victim or to a senior with Alzheimer's simply because he or she couldn't articulate her need for treatment. Yet, in cases of serious brain disorders, we allow millions to suffer because of the chaotic patchwork of State and Federal laws that says we can't even act when we know we must.

Further, when a patient is discharged from a hospital with anything from a minor cut to a heart transplant, there must be a written treatment plan, and that plan is readily shared with family members who will assist with followup, but not so with serious mental illness. Again, we would not do this to someone with Alzheimer's. We would not say, "I can't treat your grandmother until she is well enough to tell me to treat her, but I can't tell you about her treatment until she gives you permission."

These mentally ill men and women who are in need of medical attention end up sitting in jails, sleeping behind dumpsters, or being sedated and chained to hospital gurneys in emergency rooms. They cycle in and out of prison, the ER, and shelters. That is a lifestyle we have relegated 3.6 million Americans to. We deny people the right to treatment. We deny them the right to get better. How cruel is that?

As a result, 1 million Americans last year attempted suicide, and 40,000 people died from suicide. There are 300,000 homeless, 500,000 in jail, and 700,000 in other prisons. The mentally ill are also more likely to be robbed, physically assaulted, raped, and sexually assaulted. So, while several States and counties have taken bold action to help those who have been cast aside by our current system, the Federal Government sits, oblivious to the problem, and, in some cases, actually creates barriers to treatment for those who need help the most.

Serious mental illness is more detrimental to your long-term health than being a heavy smoker, and it increases your risk for diabetes, heart disease, and cancer. It reduces your life span by some 25 years. There is also a financial toll. A study conducted by Duke University determined that assisted outpatient treatment saves taxpayers \$50,000 per patient. It also increases medication compliance and decreases incarceration, hospitalization, and homelessness.

The problem is that four States still prohibit the use of this medical model, and most county health systems haven't implemented it; and studies have shown that each time individuals with mental illnesses experience a break from reality, their brains actually suffer from permanent injury. All of this is happening at a time when we know more about the brain than we ever have.

We tell families that Federal laws prohibit you from knowing why your loved one is in a mental health crisis, and doctors tell the family, "Your son is only a little dangerous right now, but please bring him back when he becomes truly violent, and then he can be treated." How absurd. Can you imagine if we told someone with diabetes, "Your blood sugar is too low, but we are going to wait until you are in a diabetic shock before we give you insulin"? The doctor would be fired, and the hospital would be sued. We would ensure that it never happens again. Yet, for families in a mental health crisis, this scenario plays out every single day, and not a word is spoken about it. The reason is that people don't understand the neurological basis of mental illness.

What we need to do is have a Congress that is able to confront its own denial and change the laws that need to be changed. We can fix the mental health system but not if Congress does not act. We must pass H.R. 3717, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, because ignoring this problem will not make it go away, and where there is no help, there is no hope at all.

IDEAL FASTENER CORPORATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate a company in my

district called the IDEAL Fastener Corporation.

Recently, they announced a \$5.7 million expansion of their facility in Oxford, North Carolina. This expansion will create 155 jobs by the year 2019, and it is welcome news for Granville County, which is an important part of my congressional district. Now, Mr. Speaker, 155 jobs in some communities across our great country may be relatively small, but in this rural community, this is a big deal.

IDEAL Fastener Corporation was established in 1936 by Elie Gut, and it has been a strong member of the Oxford community since moving its corporate headquarters there in 1966. IDEAL Fastener Corporation is still family owned and is operated by Ralph and Mary Gut and their three children—Jeff, Steven, and Michelle.

Since bringing their world headquarters to Oxford, IDEAL Fastener Corporation has grown to become the second largest zipper manufacturer in the entire world with production and sales facilities in over 20 countries. They are in the process now of launching three new products and are making major capital investments that will benefit their employees and the North Carolina economy.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, July 21, I marked my 10th anniversary here in the House of Representatives; and if there is one thing that I have come to recognize and appreciate, it is that small businesses and small industries are what drive our economy. Companies like IDEAL Fastener Corporation are the lifeblood of our economy.

I congratulate IDEAL Fastener and the Gut family on this tremendous, tremendous announcement. I wish them nothing but continued success in the future.

OBAMA ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, before President Obama leaves for his 2-week-long vacation at Martha's Vineyard, he has a lot of work to do.

Contrary to what he said in Austin, Texas, this month, Americans are not better off than when he took office in 2009. In fact, his policies are hurting families and businesses everywhere.

He should focus on what House Republicans are doing and cooperate by getting his party leaders in the Senate to act on more than 40 bills to get our economy moving, get people back to work, and roll back his administration's harmful policies like Dodd-Frank and ObamaCare—the major force behind the transition to part-time America.

Under President Obama, the average unemployment rate tops 8 percent; we have got 47 million people on food stamps; 48 million people between the ages of 18 and 64—the very heart of our

workforce—have not worked one day in the last 12 months; and nearly 91 million people over age 16 aren't working at all; almost 50 percent of the unemployed have stopped looking for work; and 76 percent of Americans are living paycheck to paycheck. The list could go on and on.

We can fix this through real tax reform, getting the government out of health care, energizing the energy business, and ensuring America remains the world's superpower with a strong and well-equipped military.

□ 1015

As a business owner and job creator for more than 40 years, I know that the constant threat of tax hikes, overregulation, and massive government overhauls hurts businesses, it burdens families, lowers income, and stifles the economy. Everyone is simply playing defense in America.

That is why the House continues to pass pro-jobs bills that empower Americans and strengthen the economy. These are real solutions that will improve the quality of life for generations to come.

So I urge HARRY REID and the Democrats in the Senate to take up these bills now before President Obama leaves for vacation.

In God we trust.

CHRISTIANITY IN IRAQ IS BEING WIPED OUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, "Imagine if a fundamentalist Christian sect captured the French city of Lyon and began a systematic purge of Muslims. Their mosques were destroyed, their crescents defaced, the Koran burned, and then all Muslims forced to flee or face execution. Such an event would be unthinkable today, and if it did occur, Pope Francis and all other Christian leaders would denounce it and support efforts by governments to stop it.

Yet that is essentially what is happening in reverse now in Mosul, as the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham drives all signs of Christianity from the ancient city. Christians have lived in Mosul for nearly 2,000 years, and today they are reliving the Muslim religious wars of the Middle Ages."

These are not my words. These are the words of the first two paragraphs of an editorial from The Wall Street Journal earlier this week.

Now, I want to read parts of an email I received yesterday from someone on the ground in Iraq:

All Mosul churches and monasteries are being seized by ISIS. There are around 30. The cross is being removed from all of them. Many of them are burned or destroyed and looted. Many of them are used as ISIS centers.

The religious Sunni, Shiite, and Christian tombs are being destroyed in Mosul. This destruction is endangering the very ancient sites, including Jonah's tomb.

It has been widely reported that the ISIS soldiers have painted "N" on the doors of Christians to signify that they are "Nasara," the word for Christians.

Shiite homes were painted with the letter "R" for "Rawafidh," meaning rejecters or protestants.

Christianity, as we now know it, is being wiped out. With the exception of Israel, the Bible contains more references to the cities and regions and nations of ancient Iraq than any other country.

I believe what is happening to the Christian community in Iraq is genocide. I also believe it is a crime against humanity.

Where is the West?

Where is the Obama administration?

Where is this Congress?

The silence is deafening. The West, particularly the church, needs to speak out.

The Obama administration needs to make protecting this ancient community a priority. President Obama and Secretary of State Kerry need to have the same courage that President Bush and former Secretary of State Colin Powell had when they said genocide was taking place in Darfur.

The United Nations has a role. It should immediately initiate proceedings in the International Criminal Court against ISIS for crimes against humanity.

The Congress needs to hold the administration accountable for the failure to act.

I will close today by reading the final two paragraphs of The Wall Street Journal editorial. It said:

Today's religious extremism is almost entirely Islamic. While ISIS' purge may be the most brutal, Islamists in Egypt have driven thousands of Coptic Christians from homes they have occupied for centuries. The same is true across Muslim parts of Africa. This does not mean that all Muslims are extremists, but it does mean that all Muslims have an obligation to denounce and resist the extremists who murder or subjugate in the name of Allah. Too few imams living in the tolerant West will speak up.

The Wall Street Journal went on to say: "As for the post-Christian West, most elites may now be nonbelievers. But a culture that fails to protect believers may eventually find that it lacks the self-belief to protect itself."

William Wilberforce, the British parliamentarian and abolitionist who abolished slavery, famously told his colleagues, as I tell this House and this administration: "Having heard all of this, you may choose to look the other way, but you can never again say you did not know."

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF SERGEANT BOB REASONER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, South Carolina and the United States lost a hero. Ser-

geant Bob Reasoner was a World War II United States Army Air Corps veteran and a tail gunner assigned to the 68th Squadron, with the famous 44th Bomb Group known as The Flying 8 Balls.

The events of December 7, 1941, compelled Mr. Reasoner to serve in World War II, survive three life-threatening missions, a year in German POW camps, and 2½ years in a hospital undergoing multiple surgeries from his injuries.

During Sergeant Reasoner's military career, he participated in 21 successful bombing missions over Germany and France. During the return flight of one of those missions, Bob's plane was unexpectedly diverted, ran out of fuel, and crashed in Wales.

While he was at the hospital recuperating from his injuries, Bob was given the option to return to the United States but turned down that offer so he could continue to serve his country.

On October 1, 1943, Sergeant Reasoner flew his last mission, during which his B-24 Liberator, the Black Jack, as it was known, was attacked and caught fire. Parachuting to the ground with his head engulfed in flames—now remember that Sergeant Reasoner was a tail gunner. He had a long way to travel from the rear of that aircraft as it burned, falling from the sky.

But as he was parachuting down, he passed out from his injuries, and he woke up in a hospital. His head and his eyes were wrapped in bandages, and all he could hear was German.

He was now a POW, captured by the German soldiers. His captors allowed him only a weeklong hospital stay before shuffling him between different POW camps over the next year.

On his 26th birthday, September 26, 1944, he returned home to the United States of America. He told me, he said: "That was the first time I felt safe. Seeing the Statue of Liberty was an amazing feeling because I knew then that I was home."

Bob Reasoner earned three Purple Hearts for his heroic service to our country. But if Bob was still alive today, he would say that he wouldn't want his service defined by his numerous distinctions that he was awarded but, rather, he would want us to remember the 21 successful missions he was a part of to help secure freedom for this country and many other countries.

I had the opportunity to meet Bob in my hometown of Clinton, South Carolina, where he was in a retirement home, and I heard his stories firsthand. And after talking to Bob, I went on to learn more about the heroic actions of the 44th Bomb Group.

During my research, I came across a great compilation by Will Lundy, who was a ground crewman on the 67th Bomb Squadron of the 44th Bomb Group, called the Roll of Honor and Casualties.

I recommend everyone look that up and read it. The stories are amazing.

This compilation documents the heroic stories of these men who fought for our freedoms, including my friend, Bob Reasoner.

He lived his life quietly among us, bearing the scars of war and service. His ear was mangled. His eyelids had been reconstructed. He bore the scars of numerous burns.

I am especially grateful for Mr. Reasoner's bravery in protecting the United States, and I grieve with his family and friends during the loss of a great man, an American soldier and a true American hero.

May God bless the men and women who served in World War II. May God continue to bless those who serve our country and have served our country, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

THE BORDER CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, wherever I go, people express a growing anger over the illegal immigration that is overwhelming our southern border.

People ask me:

"How can we talk about securing the border in Ukraine or Iraq while our own border is wide open?"

"How can we talk about supporting the population of Central America when we are nearly \$18 trillion in debt?"

"How can we talk about giving jobs to millions of illegal immigrants when fewer Americans are working today than when this so-called recovery began?"

They ask: "If the Federal Government can't defend our own border, what good is it?"

Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer them. The fact is, our southern border is wide open. It is practically undefended, and everybody knows it.

The many thousands streaming across it know that if they break our laws and enter our country illegally, they will be rewarded with free food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, legal representation, and relocation, all at the expense of struggling American families.

Ninety-five percent of them believe they will get "permiso" to stay and, at the moment, they are right.

Until we fundamentally change this reality, the mass incursion of our borders will continue, and our Nation's sovereignty will slowly fade away.

The American people are awakening to the danger that illegal immigration poses to our country. It is crowding out millions of jobs desperately needed by American workers. It is overwhelming our schools, our hospitals, our courts, law enforcement, prisons, and our local and State budgets.

Perhaps worst of all, it is undermining the process of legal immigra-

tion upon which our country is founded. Why should anyone go to the expense and trouble of obeying our immigration laws when they can reap rich rewards simply by defying them?

This administration has actively encouraged this crisis with its promises of amnesty, and it now needs another \$4 billion to feed, clothe, and house this new surge. Conspicuously lacking from the President's proposal is any serious effort at enforcement or deportation.

The advocates of illegal immigration tell us we need comprehensive immigration reform, but what they really mean is extending some form of amnesty to those now illegally in this country. Yet, it is precisely these promises of amnesty that are causing and encouraging the mass migration we are now seeing.

Any short-term measure this House approves must include provisions:

First, to rescind the President's unlawful Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals order that has clearly encouraged the current surge;

Second, to detain all of these new arrivals while expedited deportation hearings proceed;

Third, to provide unrestricted access for law enforcement to all Federal lands at the border;

And fourth, to activate the National Guard in whatever numbers are necessary to secure our southern border now.

Once the immediate tide has been turned back, it is imperative that existing laws are enforced before any new laws are considered, including:

Rigorous enforcement of sanctions against any employer who hires an illegal immigrant;

Completion of the border fence that was authorized in 2006;

Deportation of any illegal immigrant who comes into contact with law enforcement or who illegally applies for government assistance; and

Resumption of Federal cooperation with local and State law enforcement agencies to ensure enforcement of our immigration law.

If we are not willing to enforce our current laws, there is no reason to believe that any future laws will be enforced. And until we enforce them, we really can't accurately assess what changes might be needed.

The people with whom I talk are tired of excuses. They are tired of promises of future reforms. They want to see our current laws enforced and our border secured, and every act of this House should be focused on pressuring the President to do so.

History is shouting this warning at us: that nations that either cannot or will not defend their borders aren't around very long.

Let that not be the legacy of this administration, and let it not be the epitaph of the American Republic.

SENATE INACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House now for 6 months, and I regrettably rise today to express my frustration, and I know the frustration of thousands of people in my district in southwest Alabama and, I believe, people all over the United States of America.

People are tired of the stagnation coming from Washington. Just look at the disapproval rating of this Congress and the disapproval rating of our President.

The people of this country want to see action, action on growing our economy, action on cutting spending, action on health care, action on immigration, action on the crisis at the VA, action on foreign policy and all the problems we see around the world that involve our interests. They want to see action.

□ 1030

Just earlier this week, I was at the White House for a bill-signing ceremony of the Workforce Investment Act, or the SKILLS Act, as we called it here in the House.

The SKILLS Act was a great example of Democrats and Republicans in this House and the Senate coming together behind a common goal of improving our Nation's workforce training programs, which is so important at this time in our recovering economy.

During the bill-signing ceremony, the President implored us to send more bipartisan job-creating bills his way. The problem is the President doesn't need to lecture this House on that. The President needs to look no further than the majority leader in the Senate, the gentleman from Nevada.

In the House, we have passed nearly 300 bills that are sitting in the Senate, waiting for action—at least 40 of those bills are job-creating bills. We have continued in this House to do the people's work, making our way through seven of the appropriations bills that we are required by the Constitution to pass to fund the government. The Senate has not completed a single one.

Now, some may say the issue is that Republican Senators have demanded to have amendments considered. I don't think that is too much to ask. Here in the House, we have considered at least 180 minority amendments to appropriations bills alone, 180.

One of my colleagues in the House from the other side of the aisle was quoted in an article as saying that she wanted "to thank the Republicans for their generosity. I am just grateful for the bipartisanship here."

That is not the same message coming out of the do-nothing Senate. One Democratic Senator was quoted as saying that he has "a hard time getting on the train in the morning." Former Senate leaders Tom Daschle and Trent Lott have said the Senate "has degenerated into a polarized mess."

Now, this probably shouldn't come as much of a surprise because, yet again this year, the Senate failed to even pass a budget.

I was just elected this past December. Prior to that, I was in the Alabama State Senate, and in our State, the State of Alabama, as in most States, our legislature is required to pass a budget and appropriations bills every year on time, and they have to be balanced.

So every year, the Alabama Legislature passes budgets with appropriations in them on time, and they are balanced. The United States Congress can't do that, the greatest debating body ever known to the world, the United States Senate can't do that?

I can't imagine what the people in my district would think if they saw the inaction coming from the United States Senate, but they see the results of it, and it troubles them greatly.

We have heard this song and dance before, and most of us now know how it is going to end. At some point—sooner, rather than later—the House will be forced to consider a continuing resolution to prevent a government shutdown.

The Senate can prevent this by following the House in regular order, doing the people's work, making the hard decisions, and advancing individual appropriations bills, as we have done in the House.

That is how government is supposed to work, and that is the only way we are going to be able to make serious reforms to spending programs.

I have come to this body a number of times to offer amendments to pending bills that would have cut spending, and I am going to keep pushing for these types of strategic spending reductions, but when the Senate refuses to do its part, it makes this process impossible.

The Senate's inaction is going to force those in the House to make an unfair choice, and I ask them to act differently for the people of this country, so we can get things done.

EDUCATION FIRST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about education. A quality, affordable education is vital to ensuring that American students are prepared for the jobs of the 21st century. For West Virginians, for Americans to compete for jobs, they need to have the skills, knowledge, and training to make them attractive to employers.

Education opens doors. A diploma or degree brings with it the promise of a better future, better wages, a better quality of life, a better future for one's family. Without a quality education, the possibilities of life are truly limited, not limitless.

In the House of Representatives, we are taking action today to ensure that every American has access to quality education and an education that is affordable and understandable.

Later today, we will pass two bills to help students pay for college and better

manage the debt that they accrue. The Empowering Students through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act will better educate students about the financial implications of student loans and help them borrow the money they need, not all of the money that they are offered.

We hear time and time again of the crushing debt that our students are coming out of college and higher education with. We want to help them better manage that and understand that.

So with counseling on the front end, they will know what they are actually getting into, instead of waiting until the back end and hitting them with the hammer of this is where you are now, so you have got to deal with it.

We will also pass the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act which, very simply, makes permanent the American Opportunity Tax Credit.

West Virginians want to work. Americans want to work. West Virginia's employers want to hire at home. They want to have access to an educated workforce, and by investing in education, we invest in our Nation's future. We invest in growing our Nation's economy, and we invest in the future of generations yet to come.

DOMESTIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, each day, we hear about new opportunities as a result of developing our own domestic energy resources. What we hear less about is how many crises we have avoided as America has moved from energy scarcity to energy abundance.

Last week, on July 15, historian, Pulitzer Prize winner, and renowned energy expert Daniel Yergin stated that, without the recent domestic boom in oil production, the United States would be in deep economic trouble.

"I am convinced, were it not for what's happened these last few years, we'd be looking at an oil crisis," he said, according to the Pennsylvania energy news publication, StateImpact, covering Mr. Yergin's remarks.

"We'd have panic in the public. We'd have angry motorists. We'd have inflamed congressional hearings, and we'd have the U.S. economy falling back into a recession," he added.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, we have jobs coming back to the United States that were previously headed overseas due to cheaper labor and other competitive advantages. Today, the U.S. is looking a bit more welcoming for businesses and job growth and for the American worker.

From The Wall Street Journal earlier this week, "The competitive advantage that U.S. companies will receive from the lower cost provided by shale gas . . . is attracting investment from some of the industry's bigger names.

Just last week, the International Energy Agency said some 30 million European jobs are at risk as manufacturers of petrochemicals, plastics, and fertilizers are relocating to the U.S."

Additionally, as reported in Politico earlier this week, "A strange thing happened in the past few months as Ukraine battled with Russian-backed separatists, rockets flew over Israel, and much of Iraq fell to Islamist insurgents: gasoline prices for U.S. motorists stayed pretty much flat. The price at the pump has even fallen in the past week, even after Malaysia Airlines flight MH17 exploded over Ukraine and Israel sent ground forces into Gaza . . . It's yet another sign of the unexpected changes wrought by the U.S. energy boom, which has turned the United States into one of the world's largest oil producers and the biggest producer of natural gas."

Mr. Speaker, the opportunities of domestic energy production are apparent. As a result, we have new opportunities here at home and abroad. Americans are keeping more money in their pockets due to lower heating costs and prices at the pump.

U.S. businesses are bringing operations back to the U.S. to create jobs here at home. Companies from across the globe are bringing their operations to the United States, so that they can do business at a lower cost.

American families are able to find good-paying jobs. We are helping the U.S. remain competitive, and we are becoming more economically secure.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 39 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Thomas Koys, St. James at Sag Bridge Catholic Church, Lemont, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, I give You thanks and I ask Your blessing upon all gathered here. Lord, I beg You to enlighten us, and I ask You to be merciful to our country, as we strive to win that kind of peace that You desire.

As these people debate the best ways to order our society, give them humble hearts to seek that order that flows from Your supreme intelligence.

Help them to learn the lesson that You tried to teach Your chosen people in the time of Samuel, the prophet; that to be the most favored nation in

Your eyes, that nation must be unlike other nations.

Lord, I pray for ministers of all faiths that they may be protected from the penalties assigned to lawbreakers who find it their duty to follow their conscience, save those who think it their duty to destroy America.

Put in our hearts a desire to build a nation unafraid to follow Your commands.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DOGGETT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will remind the House that on July 24, 1998, at 3:40 p.m., Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police were killed in the line of duty defending the Capitol against an intruder armed with a gun.

At 3:40 p.m. today, the Chair will recognize the anniversary of this tragedy by observing a moment of silence in their memory.

WELCOMING REVEREND THOMAS KOYS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce our guest chaplain this morning, Father Thomas Koys, pastor of St. James at Sag Bridge Catholic Church in Lemont, Illinois. Fitting for a pastor who loves American history, St. James was founded in 1833 and has a historic church building completed in 1858.

A longtime Chicagoland resident, Father Koys attended St. Mary Elementary in Riverside, Archbishop Quigley Preparatory Seminary, and Niles College Seminary at Loyola University. He went on to receive two master's degrees from Catholic University of America and from University of St. Mary of the Lake.

Father Koys was ordained in 1985 and has become an important voice in the Catholic community. In 2002, he au-

thored "The Ashes That Still Remain" and also hosts a radio show on Winds of Change Radio in Chicago.

He learned to speak Spanish while on a 4-month mission in Guerrero, Mexico. Father Koys' Spanish is very much welcomed in ministering to the large Spanish-speaking population in the Chicago Archdiocese.

In the Archdiocese, he is also very active in advocating for life and for family issues, and is involved in leading the Catholic Professionals of Illinois.

An avid cyclist, Father Koys has participated in numerous cycling fundraisers to fight multiple sclerosis, which has affected his brother, John.

This afternoon, I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Father Koys to the House of Representatives, and thank him for serving today as our guest chaplain.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on the each side of the aisle.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE ANSWERS ABOUT THE IRS

(Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, for over a year, the Ways and Means Committee has led an investigation into the IRS targeting conservative individuals for their beliefs. We found that the IRS subjected Americans to harassment, going so far as to question the content of their prayers and their political beliefs, subjecting them to audits, and leaking their personal taxpayer information.

They worked on rules behind closed doors that would restrict the rights of groups to organize, to speak out, and to educate the public.

They destroyed over 2 years' worth of emails, emails that are key to the investigation.

The IRS has spent years denying, delaying, and obstructing. The American people deserve some answers, and I am committed to ensuring they know the truth of what really happened at the IRS.

THE TRAGEDY OF FLIGHT MH-17

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my deep sympathy for all of those affected by the tragedy of Flight MH-17. It is unthinkable that a commercial airliner would ever be shot down by a surface-to-air missile, and yet, that is exactly what happened in the part of Ukraine controlled by Russian separatists.

The evidence seems to point to one perpetrator, one party intent on inflicting pain and suffering upon the innocent.

The fire of Ukraine's crisis has undoubtedly been fueled by Russia and its operatives. So let this senseless tragedy serve as a wake-up call to the international community.

This conflict could end today. It is in Mr. Putin's hands. But until then, I support the sanctions that the United States has already levied against Russia and stand strongly with the people of Ukraine in their struggle for autonomy and sovereignty.

My heart will forever go out to all those lost in this horrific act of war and the loved ones they leave behind.

GOOGLE DOES A BETTER JOB THAN THE IRS

(Mr. SESSIONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, did you know that Google keeps emails for 7 years?

Google, a company which is used for personal emails, keeps your emails, evidently, longer than the IRS. Well, that is, at least, what we are understanding now from the IRS.

I think it is highly doubtful that these emails simply disappeared. And seeing the other claims by the IRS that have turned out to be falsities, I believe this is also. I do not believe that they have lost them.

First, the IRS delayed in telling the American people, through their report of the missing emails. They did not even acknowledge the problem that occurred.

Second, the IRS Commissioner Koskinen was, I believe, untruthful when he referred to these emails being missing. No, not in April, as he first claimed, but actually February 2, according to the IRS deputy associate chief counsel, did he recognize that they were missing.

Madam Speaker, I would say if Google can keep these emails for 7 years, I think the IRS should have to do the same, and if they can't do their job, we are going to, as Members of Congress, find out.

AMERICA NEEDS COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, it has been 13 months, 13 months since the Senate passed a bipartisan, comprehensive bill, and yet, the Speaker has not let that bill come to the floor.

So we filed a bipartisan bill with almost 200 cosponsors, and still the Speaker will not let that bill come to the floor. And why?

Well, first they said that the Republicans were working on their own bill,

so we waited and we waited for them to put it forward—and nothing.

Then they said they needed more time, so we gave them more time, and the Republicans gave us nothing.

Then, they said it was because the majority leader lost.

And finally, finally, the fault of not having a comprehensive immigration bill is on the children, the children at the border. We are suddenly scared of children at the border.

Madam Speaker, there is one person responsible for us not having comprehensive immigration reform, and it is the Speaker of this House.

Mr. Speaker, give us a vote on comprehensive immigration reform.

EXPECT MORE FROM THE IRS

(Mr. GOWDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOWDY. There is a hunger in this country, Madam Speaker, for things that bind us together. Americans agree the IRS should never target citizens. Americans agree the government should tell us the truth.

The IRS has offered eight different explanations for targeting our fellow citizens. If we, Madam Speaker, changed our story to government eight different times, we would be called inmates.

We can't lie to government. Therefore, government should never be able to lie to us.

We agree no President should ever prejudge the outcome of an investigation while that investigation is ongoing. No President should ever say there is not a smidgeon of corruption while an investigation is ongoing.

We agree government should play by the same rules that we play by. We have to keep our emails, we have to keep our receipts, we have to keep our records. Why should it be any different for the IRS?

Finally, Madam Speaker, if we want something in this country that unites us and binds us together, expecting more and better from the IRS seems like a really good place to start.

DECENCY AND HUMANITY

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, this week, even as the House is approving seven different bills to fight the scourge of child sex trafficking, the cry to strip rights and protections from some children persists.

Indeed, at the very same time that our Republican colleagues were speaking here on the floor about doing whatever it takes to protect vulnerable children, they were demanding that immigrant children be sent back immediately.

The support for exploited children which existed across this aisle must extend to children who were born on both sides of the border.

Sadly, fear and hysteria are creating a steady drumbeat to remove legal protections against trafficking for children who are simply seeking refuge here. Exploited children should not be politically exploited.

No, we cannot accept every one of them. We are not asking for amnesty, but how about a little human decency, a little humanity?

How about just following existing law and supplying the resources to see that it is effectively implemented?

IRS' HYPOCRITICAL WARNINGS TO TAXPAYERS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, we have a saying in Texas that one should "practice what they preach." But the IRS has released a video that states the importance of keeping good records.

Now, isn't that lovely?

Maybe they should save the lecture for Lois Lerner and the IRS "Taxocrats."

In the video, "Helen" from the IRS says:

Whether you are an individual or a business owner, you can avoid headaches at tax time by keeping good records during the year. Keeping well-organized records helps you answer questions if your return is selected for examination by the IRS.

You should usually keep these records supporting your tax returns for 3 years. You must keep all employment tax records for at least 4 years after the tax is paid.

Are you kidding me, Madam Speaker?

It is interesting. The IRS expects Americans to keep years and years of records, but they lose, misplace, destroy, and hide their own records.

The IRS says, Oh, rules for thee, but not for me.

A little more practicing and a little less preaching by the hypocritical IRS is in order.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1215

FAMILIES FIRST

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, the average family income in Stockton, California, has gone down 12 percent over the last 3 years. Families are working longer hours for less pay, and this is happening across the Nation. Wages are falling, while the cost of living inches up. That is why Democrats have a plan to put families first.

First, let's put people to work now by fixing our aging infrastructure and providing tax incentives for hiring. Then let's create a workforce of the future by providing universal early childhood education and give more Pell grants to college students.

Let's make sure that women make equal pay for equal work and that families have quality, affordable child care. I ask my Republican colleagues: Why aren't we doing these things right now? Don't the middle class families deserve some help?

There are other critical issues languishing here, such as immigration reform and action on climate change. We need leadership, not inaction. I challenge our Republican colleagues to get to work now to start solving our Nation's problems.

THE IRS SCANDAL

(Mr. LONG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LONG. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address an important issue, the scandal engulfing the IRS.

Lois Lerner is a central figure in the scandal surrounding the IRS' decision to target certain groups of Americans for scrutiny and other unequal treatment due to their political beliefs.

Now, we have learned emails pertinent to this investigation are missing in very suspicious circumstances involving multiple deletions of records and the physical loss of computer equipment.

The missing emails only add to the IRS' gross misconduct and raise disturbing questions about the professionalism and neutrality of bureaucrats who are supposed to enforce the law in a fair, evenhanded manner.

In May, the House held Lois Lerner in contempt of Congress and passed a resolution calling for the appointment of a special counsel to investigate the IRS. The IRS' conduct appears widespread and almost certainly harmed the right of free speech, which we cherish in this country.

It is critical that Congress discovers the full truth of what happened at the IRS and that the responsible individuals are held accountable for their actions.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, the Department of the Interior recently began the process of developing an offshore oil and gas leasing program for 2017 to 2022.

However, the development of a 5-year program isn't simply about which areas should be leased and drilled and which should not. It is about whether drilling in new offshore fields is the way of the future.

As a member of the Safe Climate Caucus, I am here to ask: How will we address the imminent and multiple threats of climate change resulting from our overdependence on carbon fossil fuels?

We could double down or triple or quadruple down on the energy sources of the last two centuries, or we could take steps to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels and have a sustainable energy future.

The last few years have seen tremendous progress in harvesting the renewable energy potential of our oceans. We should oppose the unwise expansion of offshore oil and gas leasing and drilling.

IRS NOT ACCOUNTABLE

(Mr. GIBBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Speaker, have you tried to use the excuse the dog ate your homework? Well, Lois Lerner, the former director of the exempt organizations of the IRS seems to think the excuse that she can't find her emails is acceptable to tell Congress.

When the House requested access to Ms. Lerner's emails, the IRS had known for months that the hard drives of hers and many other officials had conveniently been destroyed. Government agencies are missing accountability.

The American people have constantly been looking for answers as to why the IRS chose to harass taxpayers based on their political beliefs and restrict their First Amendment rights.

The IRS is currently tasked with enforcing the failing health care law, and now, they are attempting to regulate free speech. The double standard that plagues the IRS must end. Asking Americans for years of paperwork regarding their taxes is simply hypocritical when the IRS is unable to produce information required of them.

I know the investigations conducted by the various House committees will help to expose what really happened and work to prevent this kind of government overreach from occurring again. Government needs to be transparent and accountable to the American people.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, today, some of my colleagues from across the aisle unveiled their proposal to address poverty in America. It is ironic because, tomorrow, they will vote to push 6 million children deeper into poverty by excluding their low-income families from the child tax credit.

I just wish they would explain what they will do differently from their current budget, which is a hard-hearted and direct attack on the poor.

Two-thirds of the cuts in the Republican budget come from our social safety net, including Medicaid, nutrition assistance, and education. Their budget ends the Medicare guarantee and raises prescription drug costs for seniors.

It raids Pell grants, raises the already overwhelming cost of college, and slashes investments in jobs to rebuild our national infrastructure, and it does this to cut taxes by one-third for the well-off and well-connected, while continuing to reward companies that ship our jobs overseas.

Madam Speaker, cutting services for low-income Americans, blocking a livable wage, and increasing health care costs isn't a path to prosperity. It is a promise of poverty.

If we expect to have any hope of reducing poverty in generations to come, we need a strong safety net today, and we need to invest in quality education and good jobs to create opportunities for the future. Democrats promise to do that.

WITH GREAT POWER COMES GREAT RESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the IRS plays an essential role in the Obama administration. They are responsible for enforcing the failing health care law, interfering with free speech, and handling finances for the government.

Sadly, it has become apparent this organization is corrupt and, therefore, is unable to fulfill its duties to the American people.

The House has revealed a clear record of IRS harassment based on political belief, threatening jobs. Claims of missing emails are inexcusable. Proof of deliberate delinquency are apparent. The IRS is entrusted with great responsibility, yet their actions disrespect the American people they are supposed to serve.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war of terrorism.

My sympathy to the family and friends of Earl Brown, a dedicated patriot of Brookland Baptist Church.

TRANSPORTING LIQUID NUCLEAR WASTE

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my serious concerns with the Department of Energy's proposal to transport liquid nuclear waste from Ontario's Chalk River Research reactor to the Department of Energy's Savannah River Site, across several States and over the Peace Bridge, which is located in my western New York congressional district.

Unlike spent nuclear fuel, which can be safely transported in solid form, in liquid form, it is more radioactive and complicated to transfer. Most concerning is that in the event of a spill, liquid highly-enriched uranium would be difficult to contain.

A major contamination in the Buffalo-Niagara region could potentially have dire consequences on the Great Lakes, the Niagara region, and the greater Buffalo-Niagara population.

Madam Speaker, a plan that carries this level of risk should not be done without a thorough review. The Department of Energy must undertake a formal environmental impact statement before proceeding.

THE IRS SCANDAL

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, they say where there is smoke, there is fire, and as far as the IRS is concerned, with their credibility, they are engulfed in flames.

Just this week, IRS staff testified to the Oversight Committee that they may still have some of Lois Lerner's missing emails, despite earlier claims they were lost forever.

On Tuesday, the Ways and Means Committee discovered Lerner's hard drive was only "scratched," information that conflicts with their earlier statements that the data was unrecoverable.

It is clear the IRS refuses to be fully forthcoming, and their behavior continues to raise serious questions about potential criminal wrongdoing and the targeting of conservative groups.

Here in the House, we are committed to oversight, transparency, and ensuring we get the answers we need in the pursuit of understanding what really happened.

THE RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD

(Mr. BRALEY of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak out against the misguided efforts to reduce or repeal the Renewable Fuel Standard. The RFS was enacted in 2005 to improve our economy, our environment, and our energy independence.

However, it is currently threatened by an EPA draft proposal that would roll it back, and as highlighted in a recent op-ed by Senators CHUCK GRASSLEY and AMY KLOBUCHAR, by Big Oil's attempt to protect its market share and profits at the expense of American consumers.

As they wrote, "The Federal law has helped to displace oil imports, increase domestic energy security, create jobs in rural America, curb pollution with cleaner-burning fuel, and lower prices at the pump for consumers."

In Iowa, biofuels have created 73,400 jobs, pumping \$5 billion of wages annually into our economy, and \$19.3 billion of economic activity annually. In the United States, it has created 852,000 jobs, \$46.2 billion in wages, and \$185 billion in economic activity.

Why would we push back and go backwards, instead of moving forward into the future?

YOU CAN'T FOOL ALL THE PEOPLE ALL THE TIME

(Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. As the saying goes, "You can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time."

A year into investigations regarding the IRS improperly targeting applications submitted by conservative groups, the IRS claimed to have lost Lois Lerner's emails to or from outside agencies or groups for a period of more than 2 years as a result of a computer crash—not just her computer, but five others as well.

IRS Commissioner John Koskinen has told us that the hard drives on her computer and the others could not be restored and had been recycled.

As a former defense attorney, if a client told me this story, I would say: You can tell the judge and the jury whatever you want, but you are not fooling anybody, and if that is your story, you are going to jail.

MIGRANT CHILDREN

(Mr. VARGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VARGAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank the religious and faith-based communities in our Nation that have come forward to demand that we treat the children coming to our country with love and respect and not deny them their due process rights.

Here are some of the words of the faith-based community themselves. This is from the Evangelical Immigration Table, which includes the National Association of Evangelicals, the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities, and many, many more.

"The antitrafficking law is working according to its design," the religious leaders said. "It should not be changed to address the current temporary situation."

We hear from Rabbi Asher Knight of Temple Emanu-El in Dallas. "The question for us is: How do we want to be remembered, as yelling and screaming to go back or as using the teachings of our traditions to have compassion and love and grace for the lives of God's children?"

Lastly, Pope Francis writes, "A change of attitude towards migrants and refugees is needed on the part of everyone."

I hope to have that. I thank President Bush for signing the law and standing by it in this hysterical moment.

THE IRS' DANGEROUS DOUBLE STANDARD

(Mr. DAINES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAINES. Madam Speaker, imagine telling the IRS you "just lost" your paperwork; or "sorry, I accidentally deleted my tax forms, guess I won't be getting those to you."

How do you think the IRS would respond? Not well. The IRS would find your actions "inexcusable," paid back with a fine or criminal punishment, but when the IRS asks the same of us, we are expected to let them off the hook.

Losing 2 years' worth of emails is not only unlikely, but it is unacceptable. The IRS would not accept that excuse from the people of Montana, and Montanans will not accept that excuse from the IRS.

This double standard is abusive. It is irresponsible. The IRS holds a great deal of power over the individual lives of the American people, and the requirements they ask of us, we are asking of them.

As representatives of the people the IRS is hurting, the House will hold the IRS to the standards that they hold the rest of America.

ISRAEL-PALESTINE CONFLICT

(Mr. NOLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of an immediate cease-fire and cessation of hostilities between Israel and the Palestinians of Gaza, in order to resume negotiations and create a more lasting peace and security for all parties, to end this tragic conflict.

Madam Speaker, we must do all that we can to help these parties come to terms that put the Palestinians on a path to fulfilling their legitimate aspirations of independence, while with the greatest certainty that ensures the survival and the security of Israel.

I commend and strongly urge President Obama and Secretary Kerry to continue in their bold efforts in ending this war. I offer them my full support, and I ask my colleagues to do the same, so that Israel and Palestine may someday soon live side by side in peace with one another.

□ 1230

THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE HAS A MAJOR CREDIBILITY PROBLEM

(Mr. DESANTIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DESANTIS. Madam Speaker, the Internal Revenue Service has a major credibility problem. Last month, Internal Revenue Service Commissioner

John Koskinen told Congress under oath that the agency had confirmed that backup tapes storing Lois Lerner's emails were destroyed.

Now we learn from IRS officials that such tapes may, in fact, exist. Last week, the IRS filed a declaration in Federal Court stating that Lois Lerner's hard drive was destroyed and the data contained on the hard drive was unrecoverable, yet testimony provided to the House Ways and Means Committee by IRS IT professionals suggests that the hard drive was merely scratched and the data was, in fact, recoverable.

Of course, the IRS has identified roughly 80 individuals of interest in the investigation, and yet now they tell us that as many as 19 of them may have suffered Lois Lerner-style hard drive crashes.

Madam Speaker, the troubling part about this is the American citizen would never be able to get away with these types of explanations. It is intolerable to have one set of rules for the IRS and one set of rules for the rest of us.

CANCEL THE AUGUST RECESS TO DO THE PEOPLE'S WORK

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, creating opportunity for hardworking American families and reigniting the American Dream should be the top priority of this Congress, but instead, we are about to embark on a 1-month legislative recess as the House Republican leadership continues to block action on legislation to create jobs and to grow the middle class.

Legislation awaiting action in an up-or-down vote is piling up: legislation to raise the minimum wage; to renew emergency unemployment insurance; to pass comprehensive immigration reform; to rebuild our crumbling roads, bridges, and ports; enacting a manufacturing policy so that we can make things in America; and voting on paycheck fairness to ensure that women receive equal pay for equal work.

Passing all these policies would jump-start the middle class and expand opportunity for all Americans. But instead, instead of taking those up, we are about to leave town for a month of undeserved time off.

We should get to work on the work of the American people. They expect that from us, and they deserve nothing less.

SOME PEOPLE ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, as an American small businesses owner, I deliver to my accountants each and every year tremendous sums of information that is then

used to compile a tax return that I, along with my wife, like other hard-working Americans, must sign under penalty of perjury.

I have no doubt that five CPAs, given the same information from any taxpayer, would calculate five different tax liabilities. Yet when the IRS comes calling, every American is guilty until they prove their innocence.

Make a mistake or lose a receipt? For the taxpayer, guilty. Pay the penalty and interest, or the IRS will use the law to take your home, your car, your life savings, and they will put you in jail and leave your family in the ditch. But when the IRS gets caught cheating, they lie to Congress, take the Fifth, and destroy the evidence.

If they get away with this, what and who is next?

I can't help but think, Madam Speaker, that we must be getting close to George Orwell and what he described in his novel. While some people are created equal, under this administration others are more equal.

Had the IRS abused liberal groups, the press and the administration would demand the prosecution of the individuals responsible, and that is exactly what should be happening right now.

IRS: DO AS I SAY, NOT AS I DO

(Mr. BENTIVOLIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Madam Speaker, it has become apparent that the Federal agencies operate by one standing principle: do as I say, not as I do.

The IRS has shown a blatant disregard for the truth, and it is apparent there is something to hide.

Madam Speaker, I look to the other side, and I have to ask: Where is your outrage? Why have none of my Democratic friends been willing to look at the Internal Revenue Service's actions and say: Do you know what? This is bigger than partisan politics. Something is wrong here, and we need to protect the rights of Americans. Are you so committed to government power that you are unwilling to stand up and do the right thing?

Our job is to protect the rights of the people, not take them away. It is time we remember that in this Chamber.

A TALE OF TWO STANDARDS

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, Tom Brokaw said the targeting of 298 conservative groups by the IRS was "outrageous" and called for a "complete investigation and thorough housecleaning." He said:

This is not a conservative or liberal issue. It really is about trusting your government.

Chris Matthews said there was obvious "profiling" of conservative groups,

and said about Lois Lerner pleading the Fifth:

Why, if you have nothing to hide, why doesn't she sit in that witness stand and answer truthfully?

Tom Brokaw and Chris Matthews are certainly not political conservatives.

One of the leading Capitol Hill newspapers today asks, "What about the hard drive?" and says the IRS in Federal court this past Friday said Lois Lerner's hard drive was wiped clean by the IRS and sent to an outside disposal company to be shredded. There are thousands of missing emails which just happen to include those going from the IRS to the White House.

All over this Nation, people have seen that there is one standard for ordinary citizens and another for employees of the Internal Revenue Service and friends of those in the White House. We need a much simpler, fairer tax law, Madam Speaker, that would allow us to do away with the politicized IRS altogether.

REMEMBERING DETECTIVE JOHN GIBSON AND OFFICER JACOB CHESTNUT

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, on July 24, 1998, 16 years ago today, two Capitol policemen were killed in this building in the line of duty.

At 3:40 p.m., an insane man shot Officer Jacob Chestnut in the back of the head. He died where he fell. He was directing a family to the restrooms when he was killed.

The insane man ran into the office of the majority leader, Tom DeLay, my predecessor in Congress. Mr. DeLay's bodyguard, Detective John Gibson, was shot. Despite being mortally wounded, he returned fire and brought the shooter down.

Today, both Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson lie forever in glory across the river in Arlington National Cemetery. May they always rest in peace.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 24, 2014 at 10:43 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S.J. Res. 40.
With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

EMPOWERING STUDENTS THROUGH ENHANCED FINANCIAL COUNSELING ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4984.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 677 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4984.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1240

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4984) to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BLACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, every family knows the cost of pursuing a higher education is out of control. It is felt intensely each and every day by countless Americans, by parents who worry how they will put their kids through college, by students who fear they will be left with a pile of debt and no job prospects, and by working men and women who hope a degree will let them reach the next rung on the economic ladder.

We know that solutions to the college cost problem must ultimately come from States and institutions, but there are things Congress can do right now to keep the dream of a postsecondary education within reach.

Helping students find the right institution is one way we can make a difference. Yesterday, the House passed, with strong bipartisan support, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act. The legislation will arm students with the best information available in a format that is easy to understand, information that includes key facts such as an institution's costs, completion rates, and student loan debt.

Students and families currently face a tsunami of information that is the

mostly confusing, conflicting, and unnecessary. The bill streamlines the information and how it is delivered, enabling students to be smart shoppers in the college marketplace.

However, picking an institution is only half the challenge. Families then have to figure out how to pay for it, and far too many are unprepared to make those tough decisions. Some students choose loans and debt when other assistance in the form of grants and scholarships are readily available. And those that do opt for student loans often have no real concept of what they are getting into or what it means for their future.

Clearly, current policies promoting financial literacy are coming up short. That is why I am pleased to support the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act. This bipartisan legislation includes a series of reforms that will help students and families make wise financial decisions about their postsecondary education.

For example, the bill ensures borrowers—both students and parents—receive annual counseling that reflects their personal situations and requires consent each year before receiving a Federal loan. The legislation also makes sure low-income individuals who rely on Pell grants are informed about the terms and conditions of their grant.

The bill also delivers more robust counseling upon graduation, requiring that information on a borrower's loan balance and anticipated monthly payments be provided. Finally, the legislation directs the Secretary of Education to maintain a consumer-tested, online counseling tool that will help institutions put this important information into the hands of those who need it.

Madam Chairman, this legislation is part of a broader effort to strengthen our Nation's higher education. Neither this bill nor the bills passed earlier this week are a silver bullet to challenges we face. However, by working together, we can begin to make a difference in the lives of students and families, and that is precisely what the House is doing.

Madam Chairman, I want to thank the bipartisan authors of the legislation, Representatives BRETT GUTHRIE, RICHARD HUDSON, and SUZANNE BONAMICI.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill and reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise today in support of the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act.

I would like to start by thanking Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, and Congressman GUTHRIE for their leadership on this bill, which will improve the financial counseling that millions of student loan borrowers receive. I am pleased that Members are

coming together to take a meaningful step toward protecting student loan borrowers. I also want to thank the Committee on Education and Workforce staff on both sides of the aisle for their hard work to include Members' shared priorities in a bill that has earned tremendous bipartisan support.

The need for enhanced financial counseling for students is clear. More than 40 million Americans are carrying more than \$1.2 trillion in student loan debt, and default rates are climbing. At the same time there is evidence that student loan debt is a drag on the broader economy. Borrowers struggling with debt may delay purchasing a new car, a home, or new appliances. They may be unable to access capital to start a business, or they may put off saving for retirement.

Of course, the solution to the mounting burden of student loan debt will require a number of changes. We will need to address rising tuition, and we will need to do a better job of granting existing borrowers access to affordable repayment plans. But we also must help current and future students understand their rights and obligations as borrowers. And we need to help them forecast their obligations in the years after college so they can make informed decisions now and for the future.

One of the frustrations I hear frequently from former students is that they didn't understand the jumble of terms and products in the student loan market when they were borrowing. Many didn't ask questions until after they left college. What kind of loans did they borrow? When will they need to begin repayment? What will their monthly payments be, and what repayment plans will be available?

That is why I am especially pleased that H.R. 4984 goes beyond entrance counseling for new borrowers and requires annual counseling for all student loan borrowers.

Under this bill, students, whether they are sophomores or seniors, will have information about how much they have borrowed, what they are expected to borrow to complete their education, how their loans will accrue interest, and what they can expect their monthly payments to be when they leave college. They will be better able to see their road to repayment.

Importantly, providing annual counseling means that borrowers who don't graduate will still receive information about what to expect when they leave school and enter repayment. Borrowers will have more clarity on their monthly payments under two repayment plans: income-based repayment and the standard 10-year option. Streamlining this information will simplify the repayment process.

Borrowers will be reminded each year that they don't have to borrow the full amount made available, and they should consider grants, work study, and Federal loans before turning to private lenders. Unlike current practice,

borrowers will receive financial counseling before signing their master promissory note, and they will be reminded that they can repay interest before it capitalizes.

H.R. 4984 will provide for the first time important disclosures to parents who borrow for their children. Parent borrowers of student loans will be given virtually the same information about their loans as students receive. And the bill will extend counseling to Pell grant recipients so that they understand the limits on eligibility for Pell grants, and the circumstances in which they would be asked to repay their grants.

Finally, this bill delivers enhanced student loan information in consumer-tested formats to check for student understanding. It will ensure that we provide personalized borrower information that the borrowers understand.

Madam Chair, there is another reason why this bill is so important right now. Recent consumer complaints suggest that some debt settlement companies are using predatory practices to target student loan borrowers. These firms target low-income and minority borrowers, but also Americans giving back through public service careers, like firefighting, teaching, and law enforcement. These firms are reportedly charging thousands of dollars to enroll borrowers in Federal income-based repayment programs, a program that borrowers can enroll in for free.

Until we can address these predatory practices directly, this bill will go a long way to ensuring that students fully understand their eligibility for income-based repayment. In short, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act will help Pell grant recipients and student loan borrowers. It will help the borrowers anticipate their monthly payments and plan their road to repayment. This will make a real positive difference, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4984.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), a key member of the committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act.

But first, I want to say thanks to my friend from Oregon, Congresswoman BONAMICI, for putting together a coalition of both sides where we can come together to address a problem that faces so many of the people who sent us here to represent them. And to the chairman, we are going to pass three or four bills this week in a bipartisan manner. The President signed a bill that passed this committee this week as well. It shows that he is putting together where we can find common ground to solve problems that really affect the people who sent us here to represent them. We appreciate him for that.

But to address this bill: with the rising costs of attaining a college degree, many students need financial assistance to make that dream a reality. This bill will increase financial literacy by reforming the current guidelines to require annual counseling for student borrowers. In doing so, students will be empowered with the knowledge necessary to understand what they are borrowing, which financial options to draw from first, and the implication of their future debt load in repayment scenarios.

A June 2014 report from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York reported that less than 50 percent of survey respondents with student debt have what they consider a high loan literacy.

Current Federal law only requires colleges and universities to provide financial counseling to student borrowers at the beginning of their studies. In short, these students get a quick snapshot of their loan obligations after they have already committed to the first year's loans, and then again once they have accrued their entire loan burden. Making matters worse, these counseling sessions tend to be broad and not based on information specific to the borrower. Many of today's students do not have a clear picture of what their financial obligation will look like upon graduation, and aren't necessarily given any opportunity to make decisions to alter that course. So will this bill make a difference?

Well, we have an example. Indiana University—being from Kentucky, I have to admit, Indiana University has begun a process of educating students annually prior to accepting their aid package for the following year, similar to our efforts in this bill. IU found that Federal undergraduate Stafford loan disbursements dropped by \$31 million, or 11 percent, from the previous year. That is five times the decline in the national average. And they still were served in college. They just didn't take out too much excess debt.

Through this bill, we hope to expand upon what institutions like Indiana University are doing and reform the current guidelines to require annual counseling for student borrowers, and ensure that students are empowered with the information they need to take control of their financial futures.

I encourage my colleagues, and I appreciate the bipartisan support, and particularly my friend from Oregon, for working together, and I encourage my colleagues to support this meaningful legislation so we can arm students with the financial knowledge needed and help lower their debt burdens.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), a champion for access to higher education.

Ms. SINEMA. Madam Chair, I thank Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, and Representative BONAMICI for working together to find common ground on this bipartisan legislation, and I rise in support of H.R. 4984.

This legislation enacts commonsense safeguards and reforms to make financial counseling more effective for students and their families. Specifically, this legislation ensures that student loan recipients receive comprehensive information on an annual basis, detailing the terms and conditions, as well as the individual responsibilities throughout the life of their loans.

As an adjunct professor at Arizona State University, I frequently hear from my students about how difficult it is to effectively manage their student loans. One year ago, I brought stories from my own Arizona State University students to the House floor to demonstrate how student debt impacts their futures and our community.

One former student in my district, Brandy, faces over \$100,000 in student debt. While this legislation will make it easier for her to understand the terms of her loan, we shouldn't fool ourselves, because this legislation will not make repaying her loan any easier, it won't provide relief from rising interest rates, and it doesn't take meaningful steps to address the skyrocketing cost of higher education. So together, we must do more here in Congress to create quality, higher education opportunities for America's students.

So while this legislation is no substitute for a full reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, it is a good step forward. It doesn't yet provide a meaningful solution that addresses the rising cost of college, but it is very important that we stand today and make the important start to ensure students are fully informed about their loans and student debt.

I relied on Pell grants, academic scholarships, and Federal loans all through my schooling, just like my Arizona State University students do today. I know that students need guidance and assistance to manage their student debt.

I talk to young people who are excited to share their ideas and thoughts with me about how to solve some of our world's biggest problems, but it concerns me when I see these same young students are daunted by the prospect of an expensive education that they want but fear they can't afford.

Rising college costs are putting higher education and the American dream out of reach for too many hardworking American families. Education is the key to economic growth, job creation, and for many, a clear pathway out of poverty. I know this because education was the key to my own path from poverty to the middle class. So I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation and continue working together to make college affordable for Arizona students.

I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for yielding and for her hard work.

Mr. KLINE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gen-

tleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), a colleague from the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 4984, and I want to commend Congressman GUTHRIE and Congresswoman BONAMICI for their efforts in bringing this bill first to our committee and now to the floor, and I particularly want to commend the bipartisan nature with which this legislation has been developed. Hopefully it will pass today with the same support that it passed out of the Education Committee.

My other hope is that we can take this same bipartisan spirit that attends this legislation and apply it to the really, really important work that we have before us with respect to higher education and reauthorizing the Higher Ed Act, and that is specifically seeing to it that collectively we work together to see to it that the student financial aid programs embodied in title IV of the Higher Ed Act are reauthorized and, in fact, strengthened, and that they remain as robust as they need to be to ensure that students continue to have access to the educational institutions of their choice.

Frankly, title IV is in peril. I hope we can work on that. And let me be specific about at least one program in title IV, and that is the Perkins Loan Program. We have had the Perkins Loan Program since 1958. It was passed in the wake of America's shock that we were beaten into space by the Russians, and so there was an effort to make it easier for the young men and women of this country to pursue higher education. That goal, by the way, and that need that existed in 1958 still exists today. And yet under current law, if we do not act, the 2015–2016 academic year will be the last year that the Perkins loan will be in existence.

Our students across the country borrow \$1.4 billion a year.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. BONAMICI. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

So \$1.4 billion a year will be taken out of the student aid portfolio at a time when students can least afford for that to happen. Given declining incomes and rising colleges costs, students are caught in a squeeze where they are unable to meet the expenses that a higher education demands. We simply cannot let this happen, and I very much hope that again on a bipartisan basis we can renew not just this program, but we can also overcome what appears to be a policy directive of our friends on the other side to squeeze the student financial aid programs.

□ 1300

The budget resolution that passed the House of Representatives freezes

Pell grants at \$5,700 for the next 10 years. That means, 10 years from now, if that were to ever take on the force of law, the buying power of the Pell grant will be severely diminished.

That same budget resolution essentially eliminates the SEOG program and puts enormous restrictions on the college workstudy program. These are programs that are absolutely essential to a student's ability to finance their education. I very much hope we can work together to see to it that they remain as robust as they need to be.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, we have no further speakers on this side, and I am prepared to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, H.R. 4984, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act, will give student loan borrowers a much better understanding of their road to repayment. It does this by helping students track the amount they borrowed, predict monthly payments, and access affordable repayment plans.

As I mentioned, this bill is not a cure-all for the problems student loan borrowers face, which include rising tuition and opaque servicing contracts, but the bill serves a very important purpose, and it is especially important because of the cost of college and the challenges of managing student debt.

Greater transparency about what it means to borrow student loans will help students anticipate their obligations and advocate for their rights as borrowers, and perhaps greater transparency will elevate the conversation about the underlying need to address college costs.

Again, I want to thank Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, and Representative GUTHRIE for their bipartisan effort on this important bill. It has been delightful to work with them. I look forward to more bipartisanship in the Education and the Workforce Committee.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4984, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues from the committee, the principal authors of this bill—Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. GUTHRIE—for their fine work here and for the spirit of enthusiasm and bipartisanship which they have brought to this effort.

I would remind all of my colleagues, as we move forward towards reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, this is absolutely not the whole thing, but it is another important step down that road.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of the amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 113-53. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 4984

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act".

SEC. 2. ANNUAL COUNSELING.

Section 485(l) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092(l)) is amended to read as follows:

"(l) ANNUAL FINANCIAL AID COUNSELING.—

"(1) ANNUAL DISCLOSURE REQUIRED.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible institution shall ensure that each individual who receives a Federal Pell Grant or a loan made under part D (other than a Federal Direct Consolidation Loan) receives comprehensive information on the terms and conditions of such Federal Pell Grant or loan and the responsibilities the individual has with respect to such Federal Pell Grant or loan. Such information shall be provided, for each award year for which the individual receives such Federal Pell Grant or loan, in a simple and understandable manner—

"(i) during a counseling session conducted in person;

"(ii) online, with the borrower acknowledging receipt of the information; or

"(iii) through the use of the online counseling tool described in subsection (n)(1)(B).

"(B) USE OF INTERACTIVE PROGRAMS.—In the case of institutions not using the online counseling tool described in subsection (n)(1)(B), the Secretary shall require such institutions to carry out the requirements of subparagraph (A) through the use of interactive programs, during an annual counseling session that is in-person or online, that test the individual's understanding of the terms and conditions of the Federal Pell Grant or loan awarded to the student, using simple and understandable language and clear formatting.

"(2) ALL INDIVIDUALS.—The information to be provided under paragraph (1)(A) to each individual receiving counseling under this subsection shall include the following:

"(A) An explanation of how the student may budget for typical educational expenses and a sample budget based on the cost of attendance for the institution.

"(B) An explanation that an individual has a right to annually request a disclosure of information collected by a consumer reporting agency pursuant to section 612(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681j(a)).

"(3) STUDENTS RECEIVING FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.—The information to be provided under paragraph (1)(A) to each student receiving a Federal Pell Grant shall include the following:

"(A) An explanation of the terms and conditions of the Federal Pell Grant.

"(B) An explanation of approved educational expenses for which the student may use the Federal Pell Grant.

"(C) An explanation of why the student may have to repay the Federal Pell Grant.

"(D) An explanation of the maximum number of semesters or equivalent for which the student may be eligible to receive a Federal Pell Grant,

and a statement of the amount of time remaining for which the student may be eligible to receive a Federal Pell Grant.

"(E) An explanation of how the student may seek additional financial assistance from the institution's financial aid office due to a change in the student's financial circumstances, and the contact information for such office.

"(4) BORROWERS RECEIVING LOANS MADE UNDER PART D (OTHER THAN PARENT PLUS LOANS).—The information to be provided under paragraph (1)(A) to a borrower of a loan made under part D (other than a Federal Direct PLUS Loan made on behalf of a dependent student) shall include the following:

"(A) To the extent practicable, the effect of accepting the loan to be disbursed on the eligibility of the borrower for other forms of student financial assistance.

"(B) An explanation of the use of the master promissory note.

"(C) An explanation that the borrower is not required to accept the full amount of the loan offered to the borrower.

"(D) An explanation that the borrower should consider accepting any grant, scholarship, or State or Federal work-study jobs for which the borrower is eligible prior to accepting Federal student loans.

"(E) A recommendation to the borrower to exhaust the borrower's Federal student loan options prior to taking out private loans, an explanation that Federal student loans typically offer better terms and conditions than private loans, and an explanation that if a borrower decides to take out a private education loan—

"(i) the borrower has the ability to select a private educational lender of the borrower's choice;

"(ii) the proposed private education loan may impact the borrower's potential eligibility for other financial assistance, including Federal financial assistance under this title; and

"(iii) the borrower has a right—

"(I) to accept the terms of the private education loan within 30 calendar days following the date on which the application for such loan is approved and the borrower receives the required disclosure documents, pursuant to section 128(e)(6) of the Truth in Lending Act; and

"(II) to cancel such loan within 3 business days of the date on which the loan is consummated, pursuant to section 128(e)(7) of such Act.

"(F) An explanation of the approved educational expenses for which the borrower may use a loan made under part D.

"(G) Information on the annual and aggregate loan limits for Federal Direct Stafford Loans and Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans.

"(H) Information on how interest accrues and is capitalized during periods when the interest is not paid by either the borrower or the Secretary.

"(I) In the case of a Federal Direct PLUS Loan or a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan, the option of the borrower to pay the interest while the borrower is in school.

"(J) The definition of half-time enrollment at the institution, during regular terms and summer school, if applicable, and the consequences of not maintaining at least half-time enrollment.

"(K) An explanation of the importance of contacting the appropriate offices at the institution of higher education if the borrower withdraws prior to completing the borrower's program of study so that the institution can provide exit counseling, including information regarding the borrower's repayment options and loan consolidation.

"(L) For a first-time borrower, the anticipated monthly payment amount under, at minimum, a standard repayment plan and, using the regionally available data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the average starting salary for the occupation the borrower intends to be employed, an income-based repayment plan under section 493C, and based on—

“(i) a range of levels of indebtedness of—

“(I) borrowers of Federal Direct Stafford Loans or Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans; and

“(II) as appropriate, graduate borrowers of Federal Direct PLUS Loans or Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans; or

“(ii) the average cumulative indebtedness at graduation for students who borrowed loans made under part D and who are in the same program of study as the borrower.

“(M) For a borrower with an outstanding balance of principal or interest due on a loan made under this title—

“(i) a current statement of the amount of such outstanding balance and interest accrued;

“(ii) based on such outstanding balance, the anticipated monthly payment amount under, at minimum, the standard repayment plan and, using regionally available data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the average starting salary for the occupation the borrower intends to be employed, an income-based repayment plan under section 493C; and

“(iii) an estimate of the projected monthly payment amount under each repayment plan described in clause (ii), based on—

“(I) the outstanding balance described in clause (i);

“(II) the anticipated outstanding balance on the loan for which the student is receiving counseling under this subsection; and

“(III) a projection for any other loans made under part D that the borrower is reasonably expected to accept during the borrower's program of study based on at least the expected increase in the cost of attendance of such program.

“(N) The obligation of the borrower to repay the full amount of the loan, regardless of whether the borrower completes or does not complete the program in which the borrower is enrolled within the regular time for program completion.

“(O) The likely consequences of default on the loan, including adverse credit reports, delinquent debt collection procedures under Federal law, and litigation, and a notice of the institution's most recent cohort default rate (defined in section 435(m)), an explanation of the cohort default rate, and the most recent national average cohort default rate for the category of institution described in section 435(m)(4) to which the institution belongs.

“(P) Information on the National Student Loan Data System and how the borrower can access the borrower's records.

“(Q) The contact information for the institution's financial aid office or other appropriate office at the institution the borrower may contact if the borrower has any questions about the borrower's rights and responsibilities or the terms and conditions of the loan.

“(5) BORROWERS RECEIVING PARENT PLUS LOANS FOR DEPENDENT STUDENTS.—The information to be provided under paragraph (1)(A) to a borrower of a Federal Direct PLUS Loan made on behalf of a dependent student shall include the following:

“(A) The information described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) and (N) through (Q) of paragraph (4).

“(B) The option of the borrower to pay the interest on the loan while the loan is in deferment.

“(C) For a first-time borrower of such loan, sample monthly repayment amounts under the standard repayment plan based on—

“(i) a range of levels of indebtedness of borrowers of Federal Direct PLUS Loans made on behalf of a dependent student; or

“(ii) the average cumulative indebtedness of other borrowers of Federal Direct PLUS Loans made on behalf of dependent students who are in the same program of study as the student on whose behalf the borrower borrowed the loan.

“(D) For a borrower with an outstanding balance of principal or interest due on such loan—

“(i) a statement of the amount of such outstanding balance;

“(ii) based on such outstanding balance, the anticipated monthly payment amount under the standard repayment plan; and

“(iii) an estimate of the projected monthly payment amount under the standard repayment plan, based on—

“(I) the outstanding balance described in clause (i);

“(II) the anticipated outstanding balance on the loan for which the borrower is receiving counseling under this subsection; and

“(III) a projection for any other Federal Direct PLUS Loan made on behalf of the dependent student that the borrower is reasonably expected to accept during the program of study of such student based on at least the expected increase in the cost of attendance of such program.

“(E) Debt management strategies that are designed to facilitate the repayment of such indebtedness.

“(F) An explanation that the borrower has the options to prepay each loan, pay each loan on a shorter schedule, and change repayment plans.

“(G) For each Federal Direct PLUS Loan made on behalf of a dependent student for which the borrower is receiving counseling under this subsection, the contact information for the loan servicer of the loan and a link to such servicer's Website.

“(6) ANNUAL LOAN ACCEPTANCE.—Prior to making the first disbursement of a loan made under part D (other than a Federal Direct Consolidation Loan) to a borrower for an award year, an eligible institution, shall, as part of carrying out the counseling requirements of this subsection for the loan, ensure that the borrower accepts the loan for such award year by—

“(A) signing the master promissory note for the loan;

“(B) signing and returning to the institution a separate written statement that affirmatively states that the borrower accepts the loan; or

“(C) electronically signing an electronic version of the statement described in subparagraph (B).”.

SEC. 3. EXIT COUNSELING.

Section 485(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “through financial aid offices or otherwise” and inserting “through the use of an interactive program, during an exit counseling session that is in-person or online, or through the use of the online counseling tool described in subsection (n)(1)(A);”;

(B) by redesignating clauses (i) through (ix) as clauses (iv) through (xii), respectively;

(C) by inserting before clause (iv), as so redesignated, the following:

“(i) a summary of the outstanding balance of principal and interest due on the loans made to the borrower under part B, D, or E;

“(ii) an explanation of the grace period preceding repayment and the expected date that the borrower will enter repayment;

“(iii) an explanation that the borrower has the option to pay any interest that has accrued while the borrower was in school or that may accrue during the grace period preceding repayment or during an authorized period of deferment or forbearance, prior to the capitalization of the interest;”;

(D) in clause (iv), as so redesignated—

(i) by striking “sample information showing the average” and inserting “information, based on the borrower's outstanding balance described in clause (i), showing the borrower's”; and

(ii) by striking “of each plan” and inserting “of at least the standard repayment plan and the income-based repayment plan under section 493C”;

(E) in clause (x), as so redesignated, by striking “consolidation loan under section 428C or a”;

(F) in clauses (xi) and (xii), as so redesignated, by striking “and” at the end; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(xiii) for each of the borrower's loans made under part B, D, or E for which the borrower is receiving counseling under this subsection, the contact information for the loan servicer of the loan and a link to such servicer's Website; and

“(xiv) an explanation that an individual has a right to annually request a disclosure of information collected by a consumer reporting agency pursuant to section 612(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681j(a)).”;

(2) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) by inserting “online or” before “in writing”; and

(B) by adding before the period at the end the following: “, except that in the case of an institution using the online counseling tool described in subsection (n)(1)(A), the Secretary shall attempt to provide such information to the student in the manner described in subsection (n)(3)(C)”; and

(3) in paragraph (2)(C), by inserting “, such as the online counseling tool described in subsection (n)(1)(A),” after “electronic means”.

SEC. 4. ONLINE COUNSELING TOOLS.

Section 485 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) ONLINE COUNSELING TOOLS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act, the Secretary shall maintain—

“(A) an online counseling tool that provides the exit counseling required under subsection (b) and meets the applicable requirements of this subsection; and

“(B) an online counseling tool that provides the annual counseling required under subsection (l) and meets the applicable requirements of this subsection.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS OF TOOLS.—In maintaining the online counseling tools described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure that each such tool is—

“(A) consumer tested, in consultation with other relevant Federal agencies, to ensure that the tool is effective in helping individuals understand their rights and obligations with respect to borrowing a loan made under part D or receiving a Federal Pell Grant;

“(B) understandable to students receiving Federal Pell Grants and borrowers of loans made under part D; and

“(C) freely available to all eligible institutions.

“(3) RECORD OF COUNSELING COMPLETION.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) use each online counseling tool described in paragraph (1) to keep a record of which individuals have received counseling using the tool, and notify the applicable institutions of the individual's completion of such counseling;

“(B) in the case of a borrower who receives annual counseling for a loan made under part D using the tool described in paragraph (1)(B), notify the borrower by when the borrower should accept, in a manner described in section 485(l)(6), the loan for which the borrower has received such counseling; and

“(C) in the case of a borrower described in subsection (b)(1)(B) at an institution that uses the online counseling tool described in paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection, the Secretary shall attempt to provide the information described in subsection (b)(1)(A) to the borrower through such tool.”.

SEC. 5. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.

(a) USE OF EXISTING FUNDS.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for maintaining the Department of Education's Financial Awareness Counseling Tool, \$2,000,000 shall be available to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—No funds are authorized to be appropriated by this

Act to carry out this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 113-546. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. KLINE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 113-546.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike "borrower" and insert "individual".

Beginning page 7, line 12, amend subparagraph (L) to read as follows:

"(L) For a first-time borrower—

"(i) a statement of the anticipated balance on the loan for which the borrower is receiving counseling under this subsection;

"(ii) based on such anticipated balance, the anticipated monthly payment amount under, at minimum—

"(I) the standard repayment plan; and

"(II) an income-based repayment plan under section 493C, as determined using regionally available data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the average starting salary for the occupation in which the borrower has an interest in or intends to be employed; and

"(iii) an estimate of the projected monthly payment amount under each repayment plan described in clause (ii), based on the average cumulative indebtedness at graduation for borrowers of loans made under part D who are in the same program of study as the borrower.".

Page 11, beginning line 7, amend subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

"(C) For a first-time borrower of such loan—

"(i) a statement of the anticipated balance on the loan for which the borrower is receiving counseling under this subsection;

"(ii) based on such anticipated balance, the anticipated monthly payment amount under the standard repayment plan; and

"(iii) an estimate of the projected monthly payment amount under the standard repayment plan, based on the average cumulative indebtedness of other borrowers of Federal Direct PLUS Loans made on behalf of dependent students who are in the same program of study as the student on whose behalf the borrower borrowed the loan.".

Page 13, line 17, insert "after receiving the applicable counseling under paragraphs (2), (4), and (5) for the loan" after "ensure that".

Page 19, beginning line 1, redesignate section 5 as section 6.

Page 18, after line 24, insert the following:
SEC. 5. LONGITUDINAL STUDY ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF STUDENT LOAN COUNSELING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education, acting through the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, shall begin conducting a rigorous,

longitudinal study of the impact and effectiveness of the student loan counseling—

(1) provided under subsections (b), (l), and (n) of section 485 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092), as amended by this Act; and

(2) provided through such other means as the Secretary of Education may determine.

(b) CONTENTS.—

(1) BORROWER INFORMATION.—The longitudinal study carried out under subsection (a) shall include borrower information, in the aggregate and disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, income, and status as an individual with a disability, on—

(A) student persistence;

(B) degree attainment;

(C) program completion;

(D) successful entry into student loan repayment;

(E) cumulative borrowing levels; and

(F) such other factors as the Secretary of Education may determine.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The disaggregation under paragraph (1) shall not be required in a case in which the number of borrowers in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual borrower.

(c) INTERIM REPORTS.—Not later than 18 months after the commencement of the study under subsection (a), and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Education shall evaluate the progress of the study and report any short-term findings to the appropriate committees of Congress.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the manager's amendment. This amendment is brought forth in close cooperation with the ranking member of the committee, my friend GEORGE MILLER.

This amendment will improve the information provided to first-time student loan borrowers and clarify that borrowers must accept their loans annually after they have completed their counseling.

The amendment will also require the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences to collect a study of the impact and effectiveness of the student loan counseling required under this act.

This amendment ensures borrowers are getting the information they need prior to making their final decisions on how to pay for their college education. It also ensures policymakers have information on how well financial aid counseling is working to prevent over-borrowing and what can be improved to make it even more effective.

The underlying bill, which received unanimous support coming out of the committee, will deliver students and parents the tools and information they need to borrow and repay their student loans in a responsible way. This amendment improves the bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, the manager's amendment, which I support and encourage my colleagues to support, helps bolster counseling for first-time borrowers, so that they are fully aware of the financing they may be required to use over their entire college education.

The manager's amendment also ensures that students needing to borrow a student loan receive counseling before they sign the master promissory note.

I am also pleased that this manager's amendment includes my proposal for the Department of Education to do a comprehensive, longitudinal study on the impact and effectiveness of current student loan counseling practices, so we know what actually works.

We owe it to student loan borrowers and higher education institutions to find out if the counseling requirements affect borrowers' understanding and their decisions.

In particular, we need to know if the programs we create in Congress improve outcomes for students. Will enhanced financial counseling help more students earn degrees, borrow less, and successfully enter repayment? We need to know if these outcomes benefit equally students of different races, ethnicities, genders, and income levels.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bipartisan manager's amendment, so that students can have more and better and high-quality information about their student loans.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon for her support of this amendment. She is a principal author of the underlying legislation and her support of this amendment is very, very helpful.

I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 113-546.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, after line 11, insert the following:

"(C) An introduction to the financial management resources provided by the Financial Literacy and Education Commission.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today as someone who went to college with the help of grants and loans and the support of a family and a community that had my back. It is in that spirit that I rise today to offer an amendment designed to help students and borrowers get access to more information about sound financial practices.

We know that financial literacy is important. It helps provide people with a roadmap for making sound financial decisions, to avoid or get out of debt, to prepare for emergencies, and to save for a brighter future.

Studies have found that 20-somethings have an average debt of \$45,000, primarily from student loans, but also from car loans, mortgages, and credit card debt. When the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development provided an international financial literacy test, American students ranked below average.

We need to do more to promote financial literacy, and it is particularly important that students who are getting federally-supported loans are getting the tools that they need to keep their finances on track.

We need to support resources that teach students financial literacy and provide them with the tools that they need to improve decisionmaking and strengthen their household budgets. Helping more students shore up their financial management skills also has a direct impact on the economic and financial stability of our country.

Congress took a critical step forward in providing these resources by creating the Financial Literacy and Education Commission as part of the Fair and Accurate Credit Transaction Act of 2003, legislation that passed the House with overwhelmingly bipartisan support and was signed into law by President George W. Bush.

The Financial Literacy and Education Commission developed resources that help consumers better understand financial products. It offers guidance on how to financially prepare for and respond to major life events, and it gives tips on savings and borrowing and deterring fraud.

The amendment that I offer today would direct universities and the Department of Education to provide students with information about the financial management resources provided by the Financial Literacy and Education Commission.

For many students, a student loan is the first loan of their lives. As students consider the financial assistance that they need to get a decent education, it is critically important that they have the information they need to responsibly manage their finances.

I particularly want to applaud the ongoing work and leadership in promoting financial literacy by the co-chairs of the House Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus, including Representative HINOJOSA, who has been a

strong advocate of financial literacy initiatives and played a critical role in creating this commission.

I am also pleased to be joined by my colleague from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), who sponsored this legislation that helped create this commission.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Chair, I want to commend the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) for what I consider a straightforward, commonsense amendment.

This is an amendment to the Fair and Accurate Credit Transaction Act, what we commonly call the FACT Act. The FACT Act is known for a free credit report and the requirement on the three main credit reporting agencies to amend their records.

If you notify one of an error, they have to make an examination and then correct it. Financial literacy was also an important part of the FACT Act because you have your credit report, but if you don't have good financial literacy, it is not going to be a good credit report.

In 2003, the subcommittee—which I chaired at that time—passed this in the full committee, and we had bipartisan support. Judy Biggert—who is no longer with us—from Illinois, I think, was one of the leaders on our side, but there were many on both sides.

A commission was formed without almost any cost to the people, and it did a lot of good research on financial literacy, how to avoid bad financial decisions, debt load, what different financial products were there, where to turn in case of an emergency. It is called mymoney.gov. It is an excellent resource.

What we found—and Mr. KILMER did a lot of work on this and Mr. HINOJOSA and others—is that people are not utilizing that and that colleges and universities, when students apply for loans, they are not directing them to that site, which can actually save them money upfront. So what this does is it engages the colleges and universities and simply encourages them to have their students take advantage of them.

Particularly, there is an urgency today because we often hear that students are leaving school with high debt loads, and hopefully, as a result of this amendment and other steps that are being taken in this important legislation overall, students in the future can avoid some of the mistakes and not graduate with such a heavy debt load.

It is refreshing to have a bipartisan measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I thank Mr. KILMER for yielding.

I rise in support of the Kilmer-Hinojosa-Bachus-Petri-Tsongas amendment. This amendment will ensure that students are aware of important consumer information tools of the Financial Literacy and Education Commission created by the Treasury.

□ 1315

We know that students often lack basic financial literacy, which makes it hard for them to make thoughtful decisions on complex financial products. Financial institutions may be providing information that is designed to steer young people into accounts that may not be best for them.

Providing important consumer information in an unbiased way can increase financial literacy of students and may help reduce college costs. That is exactly what this amendment accomplishes.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment so students can be equipped with better and more comprehensive financial literacy tools.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Chair, I would simply recognize Mr. PETRI's and Ms. TSONGAS' contributions in helping Mr. KILMER with this amendment—and there may be others.

I want to express to the full committee chair our appreciation for supporting this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Chair, I just want to close by thanking Mr. BACHUS not just for his support of this amendment, but for his career of work on behalf of financial literacy, and not just working on behalf of our students, but all of our families.

I also want to thank the rest of my fellow cosponsors of the underlying bill, as well as the chairman and the ranking member and their staffs for working with me on this amendment.

As someone who couldn't have gone to college without the assistance of financial aid, I am hopeful that this will take a meaningful step toward providing young people with tools that they need to live financially responsible lives.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113-546.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, after line 11, insert the following:

“(C) Based on the most recent data available from the American Community Survey available from the Department of Commerce, the estimated average income and percentage of employment in the State of domicile of the borrower for persons with—

“(i) a high school diploma or equivalent;

“(ii) some post-secondary education without completion of a degree or certificate; and

“(iii) a bachelor's degree.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Chair, I rise today to support giving students and families the resources needed to make informed decisions about both their education and their finances.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) for his great work on this bill. I also want to thank the chairman, Mr. KLINE, and Ranking Member MILLER for working in a truly bipartisan process on this legislation to provide students with commonsense, personalized financial counseling about one of the greatest investments a student can make: their investment in their own education.

I strongly support the underlying legislation and offer this amendment as a complement to better inform students about not only the costs, but the benefits of completing their education.

With tuition rates quickly outpacing grants and scholarships, American students and their families increasingly rely on student loans to access higher education. Coupled with increased enrollment, student loan debt has ballooned to more than \$1.2 trillion—greater than credit card debt, for the first time in history.

Last summer, we came together to pass bipartisan legislation which decoupled student loan interest rates from the whims of Washington and provided students and families the certainty needed to make long-term plans for the future. The bill before us today continues that mission by giving students the information they need to understand the rights and responsibilities that come along with investing in their higher education.

For many students, these loans are their first and often most costly experience as a borrower. Failing to provide students with the information they need to make responsible decisions and manage their debt does not just impact the delinquent borrower, but also the taxpayers.

Similarly, having students understand both their monthly and lifetime costs of debt they are accruing will enlist students in the fight to get student loan debt under control.

That said, despite mounting debt, a college degree is still generally one of the best investments students can make. For example, the average in-

come for young adults with a bachelor's degree is just over \$50,000, with only 4.9 percent unemployment. The dropoff for individuals who do not finish is steep, around \$13,000 per year of income and a much higher unemployment rate of 7 percent.

We do not want students failing to complete their degree simply because they fear taking out additional loans. That is why I am putting forward this reasonable amendment to improve the underlying legislation by simply adding the inclusion of income and employment data for different levels of educational attainment. This information would strengthen the counseling required by improving students' perspectives as they take charge of their future and their finances.

Madam Chair, this major potential earnings reduction, combined with hefty student loans in repayment, is a recipe for financial disaster. That is why it is so important that students and families have the full picture when making decisions regarding investments in higher education, as the underlying bill offers.

I urge my colleagues to support this simple yet important amendment to make sure students can make the best decision possible while understanding the full impact of student loans they take out.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113-546.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 4, strike “(E)” and insert “(F)”.

Page 4, after line 3, insert the following:

“(E) An explanation that if the student transfers to another institution not all of the student's courses may be acceptable in transfer toward meeting specific degree or program requirements at such institution, but the amount of time remaining for which a student may be eligible to receive a Federal Pell Grant, as provided under subparagraph (D), will not change.”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, we all know that higher education is a key to the ladder of success in the United States. It is one of the most important things that we can invest in. We just recently saw a

study that showed that if, in fact, you have a 4-year degree, you are going to make significantly more than if you just graduated from high school. You can imagine that in today's world—at least where I live in California, the innovation State—a master's or a doctorate is really what you need to have.

The value of a degree is very, very important, but we also see, of course, the student debt increasing. Students get out with their bachelor's degree, have a mound of debt, and then they are trying to get a master's, a Ph.D., or a profession. It is very, very difficult.

One of the most vital programs that we have in the United States is the Pell grant program to help them. But let's face it, it is very difficult to understand all the ins and outs of how to get a Pell grant, how you use it, the purpose, how many units you can take, what you can't take, how long it can take you, et cetera, et cetera. So it is another burden that we are putting on the students and the families when they don't really get the good picture of how to use that program.

My amendment would help spell out for students and families how that Pell grant would be used. It would simply require institutions to better counsel transfer students on their maximum Pell grant eligibility and the effect that it may have as a result of credits in courses that don't transfer to another institution.

I know that, at least in California, when we look to go to the university, we usually say let's do the first year at the least expensive place to do it, and that would be our community college—which, by the way, they are the gems of our community. They are doing incredible work.

But sometimes when students using the Pell grant get there, they might have, for example, some remedial classes. They might have to brush up on their English or their math. In doing that, the Pell grant is being used up, and then those units don't transfer to that 4-year university they go to. So the student ends up miscalculating what it is really going to cost them to finish off their diploma.

This amendment simply looks to make these types of obstacles obvious and transparent to possible transfer students so as to have the clearest view of their degree timelines and the impact on their financial aid.

Let's ensure that students have the clearest information, that they get it upfront, and that they understand how they are going to get this done. In fact, a lot of these students are sometimes first-timers in their families who are trying to achieve a diploma from a university.

We are still miles away from getting that achievement gap closed in many of our communities. I know we have been working on it for a long time now in Orange County, California, but this will be a little piece of trying to get that.

While I am at it, I would like to thank Congressman GUTHRIE, Congressman HUDSON, and Congresswoman BONAMICI, who have, in good faith, championed the work on this bill. I still wish we could get to the Higher Education Act, but if we can't do that, this is a good first step.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I want to make the point that I am supporting all of the amendments offered today, but I wanted to take this opportunity with this particular amendment to thank the gentlewoman from California, because this amendment makes sure that these students in this confusing world that we are trying to help sort out get a clear explanation that their Pell grant eligibility is limited to 12 semesters and it will not reset if they transfer.

That is just an example of the kind of confusion that is out there, and it is one of the reasons that we insisted on putting counseling for Pell grant recipients, not just loan recipients, in the base bill. But her language brings absolute clarity to this issue. I thank her for that.

I support this amendment and the other amendments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. LINDA SANCHEZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 113-546.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 10, insert at the end the following: "an explanation of treatment of loans made under part D and private education loans in bankruptcy,".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Chair, this amendment is very simple. It would add an explanation of how Federal and private student loans are treated in bankruptcy to the list of the disclosures contained in the underlying bill.

Unfortunately, too many students lack basic financial literacy, and if

they don't have a proper understanding of their rights and responsibilities when it comes to student loans, it can lead to serious consequences for their financial future.

That is why I am pleased to support this legislation that Mr. KLINE has offered—he has done such a good job bringing a bipartisan bill here—and the important financial counseling it requires.

However, one area that is not included is an explanation of the stringent requirements we have placed when it comes to erasing your student loans in bankruptcy.

While bankruptcy is never something to be taken lightly, our system does allow an honest but unfortunate debtor the opportunity for a fresh start if their financial situation is desperate enough. Most people assume that their student loans can be discharged along with their other consumer debts during bankruptcy proceedings, but that is not the case.

□ 1330

Under current law, borrowers must show that continuing to back their loans would impose an "undue hardship" on them and their dependents, a standard that, in practice, is nearly insurmountable. Bankruptcy law exempts very few types of debt from elimination through the bankruptcy process, but there are certain exceptions. For example, for principled policy reasons, we exempt child support, taxes, criminal fines, and intentional torts. In 1978, Congress added Federal student loans to this list.

This protects Federal student loan programs—and the taxpayer dollars that fund them—from fraud and abuse by borrowers. This also makes sense because Federal loans offer certain protections to ease the burden on debtors, like fixed interest rates and opportunities for deferments, income-based repayments and forbearance; but in 2005, the Bankruptcy Protection Act was passed, and the bankruptcy protection was extended to private loans, which are not required to have and often do not have such consumer protections. In fact, private lenders often market directly to students, luring them into unaffordable loans that saddle them with debts for decades to come.

That is why I have introduced legislation to remove the exemption for private student loans and why the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has called for a study on whether bankruptcy rules for student loans should be modified. That, however, is not the issue here. The fact remains that this is the law, and students should be aware that their loans, both Federal and private, can only be discharged in bankruptcy in exceptional circumstances. That is why I propose this small refinement to the underlying legislation—to ensure that borrowers understand the hurdles they may face in wiping the slate clean.

I thank Mr. KLINE for allowing this and the Rules Committee for allowing

this amendment to be made in order, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I think, again, this amendment is underscoring the many issues that students and their parents and families are facing as they go into this postsecondary education adventure. Some of them, really, are coming off of jobs. The last thing they are thinking about is bankruptcy or the size of their loans. Most of them don't even know what bankruptcy is—or many of them don't know. Maybe they are a lot smarter than I was at that time.

This amendment makes it clear that they understand the difference between the rules under a student loan—if they don't pay it or can't pay it—and under other loans. Without this sort of explanation, they wouldn't have any idea that their loans were not dischargeable in bankruptcy except, as the gentleman says, in some unusual circumstances.

Again, that is why this sort of financial counseling early and often is going to be very careful, because this isn't a simple matter of taking out—we will use a car loan as an example with a set amount, a set interest—a set amount that you pay back for a set number of years. Folks understand how that works. But in having student loans merged with all sorts of other programs—workstudy programs and Pell grants and so forth—it is no wonder that students are graduating, stepping out and—oh, by the way—they can't find jobs because the economy is in so much trouble. They had such high expectations when they stepped into their college experiences or their postsecondary experiences, and then they came out and found out that the jobs weren't available, and they have this confusing mess that they have to deal with, and the last thing that they ever gave any thought to was this whole notion of bankruptcy.

I thank the gentleman for his amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Chair, I thank Mr. KLINE for his explanation and his support. He is upriver from us, but that is where the Mississippi River starts before it becomes so beautiful on the bluffs of the city of Memphis.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Now I can't pass it up.

Madam Chair, there is quite a bit of difference in the Mississippi River between the gentleman's district and Minnesota. In fact, you can step across the Mississippi River in Minnesota, and I don't think that is true—in fact, I am absolutely positive that it is not true—anywhere else. It is always interesting when we have guests come to our great

State. When we ask them if they would like to step across the river, they are disbelieving until we take them up there to Itasca. Literally, it is no wider than this desk.

I wish that trying to figure out one's student loans and grants and work studies were as easy as getting across the Mississippi River.

I yield back the balance of my time.
The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. HAHN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 113-546.

Ms. HAHN. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 10, line 5, strike "and the" and insert "the most recent national average cohort default rate, and the".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HAHN. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am proud to support the legislation that we are considering today, and I applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for coming together to work on this important bill.

As we have been hearing, it is critical that we provide our Nation's students with the information they need to make informed decisions about what colleges they should attend and how they should pay for them.

I think the authors of this bill did a great service by including a provision to provide students with information about the student loan default rate for the schools they plan to attend. However, I believe that this legislation does not provide the students with the national student loan default rate across all schools, making it harder for them to have an accurate understanding of where their prospective schools stand nationally.

I have introduced a simple amendment to provide student loan borrowers with the latest national average default rate for all schools. If this amendment passes, all students, as they are applying for their student loans, will know what the default rate for student loans is at the schools they are choosing to attend versus the national default rate for student loans. I believe that this will allow students to better determine whether an institution has a record of delivering a quality education that is right for them. By providing students with more tools in their pursuits of education, students will be able to make more informed choices and save taxpayers the cost of more Federal student loans going into default.

Students in my district and around the country know the burden of student loan debt all too well. Giving our students all of the information will give them a better chance of being able to repay their loans and build successful futures.

Mr. Chairman and my colleague, Ms. BONAMICI, I applaud you on your work on this strong and important piece of legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS OF MICHIGAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 113-546.

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, after line 16, insert the following new subparagraph, and redesignate the succeeding subparagraphs accordingly:

(E) in clause (ix), as so redesignated—

(i) by inserting "decreased credit score," after "credit reports,"; and

(ii) by inserting "reduced ability to rent or purchase a home or car, potential difficulty in securing employment," after "Federal law,";

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 677, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that builds upon the existing language in this bill to strengthen protections for American students. My amendment ensures students have the information that they need to make important financial decisions that could impact their lives long after graduation.

As you may be aware, combined student loan debt in our Nation has topped \$1 trillion, and the unfortunate reality is that many of those students do not know the enormous harm that defaulting on that debt can cause to them. Nearly 15 percent of the student loan borrowers default within 3 years of graduation, and this can have serious consequences on their ability to rent an apartment, to purchase a car or a house, or to even obtain future employment.

Madam Chair, I applaud the spirit of this bipartisan legislation to provide enhanced financial counseling services to our Nation's students, and I look forward to voting in favor of it. My amendment will make a very simple adjustment to ensure the full effectiveness, however, of the bill.

My amendment will simply require that all student borrowers receive an

explanation of the impact of a delinquency or of a default on loans to their credit scores, including the borrower's future ability to find employment or to purchase a home or a car. It is important for students to have this information when they first receive the loans. For many recent graduates, the idea of a credit report or a credit score may seem very abstract. My amendment ensures that the impact of delinquencies or defaults are explained in very concrete terms.

Recent graduates are the top in their fields but, all too often, fall behind when it comes to financial literacy, which can have a lasting impact on their lives, and it can also take a toll on our economy. For more than 20 years, I worked as a financial adviser, helping families plan for their futures. It is important that all of our graduates understand how the decisions they make today will affect them and their families down the road when they are finding a job, buying a car, or renting or trying to own a home. We need to promote financial literacy when it can do the most good—before a borrower gets in trouble.

As we continue working to make college more affordable for our students, I believe this legislation and my amendment to it are both commonsense steps in the right direction that we can act on immediately. I look forward to a strong bipartisan vote on this bill, and I hope the Senate takes up this important legislation in a timely manner. I urge my colleagues to join me in the support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) having assumed the chair, Mrs. BLACK, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4984) to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3393, STUDENT AND FAMILY TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4935, CHILD TAX CREDIT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 680 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 680

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the

House the bill (H.R. 3393) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4935) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to the child tax credit. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-54 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. (a) In the engrossment of H.R. 3393 the Clerk shall—

(1) add the text of H.R. 4935, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 3393;

(2) conform the title of H.R. 3393 to reflect the addition of H.R. 4935, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(4) conform provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

(b) Upon the addition of the text of H.R. 4935, as passed by the House, to the engrossment of H.R. 3393, H.R. 4935 shall be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1345

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of two measures, H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act, and H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014.

The resolution provides a closed rule for consideration of these two measures, as is customary with tax legislation. In addition, the resolution provides for 60 minutes of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means for both H.R. 3393 and H.R. 4935. And it provides for a motion to recommit on each bill.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the rule combines both H.R. 3393 and H.R. 4935 before sending it to the other body.

Madam Speaker, with tuition prices continuing to climb, more Americans are struggling to plan for and afford higher education. Today's broken Tax Code makes it even harder to pay for college, with 15 complicated, overlapping education provisions that take the IRS 90 pages to explain.

We need to simplify education tax benefits so families can actually use them, and we need to get our economy back on track so students and families are earning enough to afford a good education.

H.R. 3393 takes a good first step. It consolidates four current tax benefits for higher education, the American opportunity tax credit, the Hope Scholarship credit, the lifetime learning credit, and the college tuition deduction into a new, simplified and, most importantly, permanent tax credit.

In addition, H.R. 3393 also includes strong antifraud provisions requiring taxpayers to include on their tax return the name and taxpayer identification number of the student and the employer identification number of the applicable higher education institution.

In addition, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 4935, which modernizes and improves the child tax credit. Originally created in 1997 to help ease the financial burden that families incur when they have children, this credit has failed to keep pace with the cost of raising a child. Initially, it provided a maximum credit of \$400 per child. However, under the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, this credit was expanded to \$1,000 per child, was made partially refundable, and was indexed for inflation.

Unfortunately, some of these good changes expired in 2010. I would note for my colleagues that even with these increases, since 1960, the cost of raising a child has increased by approximately 4.4 percent a year.

H.R. 4935 would index the child tax credit for inflation, eliminate the marriage penalty, and would require an individual to include their Social Security number on their tax return to claim the refundable portion of the child tax credit.

Current estimates suggest that at least \$13 billion in improper refundable tax credit payments are made each

year. This provision would help to combat that growing problem.

Madam Speaker, the cost of raising children increases every year, but the current child tax credit fails to take these increased costs into account. In addition, the current tax credit penalizes married couples.

By making these commonsense changes, we can ensure that the credit truly serves its intended purpose.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation, which continues our targeted approach to updating, improving, and modernizing the Tax Code.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlewoman for recognizing the great State of Colorado, where we hope to have you visit my district and ski in Vail, or perhaps enjoy the comfortable, temperate summer weather in our mountain resort area.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills, H.R. 4935, the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014, and H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act.

These two so-called extender bills, which are among several that this body has considered, are all unpaid for.

Instead of allowing amendments on these bills, they are brought before us under an entirely closed process that blocks efforts by either Democrats or Republicans to come up with new and better ways to improve the effectiveness of these tax cuts, or to provide offsetting cuts to expenditures or closing other revenue loopholes that would pay for these tax cuts. So, essentially, this is not a real proposal before us today.

I think that the child tax credit and Student and Family Tax Simplification Act are widely popular on both sides of the aisle, but real policy discussion is how we pay for them. That is the real discussion. That is what the House and the Senate will need to negotiate. That is what the President will need to negotiate.

I am happy to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to come up with corresponding cuts so that these can be paid for. But, under this closed rule, we are not even able to have a discussion of that. We are considering yet another set of unpaid-for tax extender bills that will add to our deficit.

Now, at the beginning of this year, Chairman CAMP put forward a true, revenue-neutral comprehensive tax reform bill. That was a real attempt to not add to our ballooning deficit and reduce taxes. To be clear, this is not.

While I oppose this bill, I certainly support the intention of the American Opportunity Tax Credit, which is to provide incentives for people across the

country to pursue higher education, and I look forward to the real discussion of how we pay for it. Money doesn't grow on trees.

Students can receive a maximum annual credit of \$2,500 for pursuing college, vocational school, or a university to help them pursue their dreams of achieving a postsecondary education, which is more important than ever to have a chance at succeeding in the 21st century workforce.

I am pleased the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act authorized the AOTC to help both undergraduate and graduate students pay for their studies. I am thrilled the Republicans now support extending provisions of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. That is a positive development for families across our country.

In my home district of Colorado, I am pleased to have two flagship research universities, Colorado State University and the University of Colorado at Boulder, which are leading the way in undergraduate and graduate education and research that benefits our communities and our health.

Students at these universities shouldn't have to spend their time wondering how the Tax Code will affect their ability to pay for books and tuition. They should be learning. They should be engaged in research and innovation to grow our economy, and not have to play the guessing game about what Congress does, which this bill, unpaid for, only furthers.

Now, while this legislation would extend the AOTC to help more traditional students, unfortunately, it would take away educational benefits from the majority of students today.

By replacing the Hope Scholarship Credit and eliminating the Lifetime Learning Credit, we will harm adult learners and those who might have lost their jobs in one sector and are trying to get training to go into another growing sector so that they can improve their life station.

Many students who use the Lifetime Learning Credit, which has no limit on the number of years it can be claimed for each student, are low-income Americans, out-of-work Americans, folks who we want to get back to work so they are not reliant on government programs.

Madam Speaker, why would we remove a tax credit that provides incentives for adults to learn throughout their lives at a time in our economy where it is more important than ever to do so?

We need to recognize the changing demographics and ensure that our tax system aligns with the real needs of 21st century learners.

That is why the major higher education associations, including the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Council on Education, and the Association of American Universities all oppose this legislation. These colleges and universities want to make higher education

more affordable, not just for traditional students but for lifelong learners as well.

I applaud my colleagues for recognizing the challenge of college affordability. I applaud my colleagues for basing a program around expiring provisions of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

I was thrilled that just yesterday the House passed H.R. 3136, the Advancing Competency-Based Education Demonstration Project Act, which I coauthored with Representative SALMON, by a vote of 414-0. How wonderful the Democrats and Republicans were able to come together around a practical method to reduce costs and improve the quality of college.

While this legislation would provide much-needed relief for some students, it is far from making college more affordable for everybody. Unfortunately, the legislation called forth under this rule would actually increase our Federal deficit by approximately \$96.5 billion over 10 years.

Let's have a real discussion about making college more affordable. Let's have a real discussion about paying for it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my friend. We do agree conceptually on quite a bit in terms of the Tax Code. I think both of us individually, and both sides collectively, honestly want to do things that make it easier for people to pursue a higher education.

Certainly, I think we are all interested in eliminating the marriage penalty as well. So I think we are moving broadly in the same direction, even though we have some disagreement.

I will point out to my friend that it is not unusual that tax legislation would come to the floor in a closed rule. As a matter of fact, that is almost always the way it is done, simply because you have to be able to score the items, and you have to understand what the real cost of tweaking is.

So whether Republicans or Democrats are in control, a closed rule is usually the order of the day on any tax legislation.

I appreciate my friend's concern about the deficit, and in that I am quite sincere.

Now, I do also always like to point out to my friends that when they were in the majority, for 4 years in a row the deficit got greater each year. And since we have been in the majority the last 4 years the deficit has gotten smaller each year.

So I actually think that we not only have a rhetorical concern about the deficit, we have demonstrated over and over again that certainly this current majority is very, very serious about dealing with it and will continue to do that by reining in spending and putting forward thoughtful reform proposals, which I believe we have done.

I would also point out to my friend, and I think he would agree with me on this, this is a vehicle. This is not going to be the final product. My friend is exactly correct when he says there will be a negotiation.

Our concern has been, watching what has been going on on the other side of the rotunda, so to speak, is that there hasn't been very much serious work. We think they are going to look at the extenders package in terms of tax relief and basically just try and jam that through without any thoughtful pruning and without making elements of it which have been approved over and over and over again, and which are clearly popular on a bipartisan basis, permanent.

So that is what we are trying to do. I think we are constructing a platform to go into negotiation with the Senate. And I suspect what emerges will be somewhat different than what either side goes in with. That is pretty normal in the legislative process.

But I think the concepts here that we are moving forward on are correct and, I think, have broad popular appeal and bipartisan support. These are provisions—and we have done this over several bills now—that both parties have approved overwhelmingly, time and time again on a sort of yearly basis. And we want to take those things and make them permanent.

I suspect, in that process, some things that are less popular might be jettisoned. But again, that is for the negotiators to decide. We are simply trying to get to that conference.

We are marking out what our position is. We recognize the Senate will have to do the same thing, and from there we will move and, perhaps, at a later point in this process we can find ourselves actually on the same side.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend from the State of Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my fellow Rules Committee Member and RSC president now, rapid ascent, to make whatever remarks he cares to.

□ 1400

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from Oklahoma for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, the Rules Committee has a tough job, but it is interesting to hear folks down here talking about both their agreement on tax reform and deficits and their agreement about what a rule ought to look like.

I have kind of gotten a little bit of both of their passions with me today, Madam Speaker, because Ways and Means bills do have to come to the floor under a closed rule.

The way the rules work, if you have an open rule, anything that is relevant to the underlying bill, you can discuss, so when you bring a tax bill to the floor, suddenly, the entire Tax Code becomes available for amendment, and you can imagine what a brouhaha that would be. I would enjoy that debate. I would thoroughly enjoy that debate, but it would never, ever end.

That is not so with our spending bills. When our spending bills come to the floor, they come under a completely open process, so that we can examine the underlying spending.

Just to take folks through the Rules Committee process a little bit, Madam Speaker, what we did here is we waived the CutGo provision in the rules. There are a lot of focus groups going on around the Chamber right now about how we should change the rules to make the system work better.

Sometimes, in the Rules Committee, we end up waiving some of the rules to make the system work better. Some folks think it makes it work better, some folks think it makes it worse, but we should have that conversation as a body.

We had to waive CutGo in this rule, Madam Speaker, because it increases mandatory spending. I have a bill beside me—and it really drives this point home. In fact, I think it was the gentleman from Colorado who was making this point.

We voted on the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill this year. It was a \$3 billion spending bill. We had eight amendments on the floor of the House. It passed. We voted on the Financial Services spending bill. It was a \$21 billion spending bill. We had 51 amendments on that bill. We passed it out of the House.

We voted on the Energy and Water spending bill, a \$34 billion spending bill, with 78 amendments on the floor of the House. We voted on the Commerce-Justice-Science bill, a \$51 billion bill, with 84 amendments on the floor of the House. It goes on: Transportation, \$52 billion, with 68 amendments; Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, \$71 billion, with 24 amendments.

It brings us to one of the underlying bills today, a bill that I think touches the heart of absolutely every man or woman in this Chamber, our constituents back home, trying to help our children access the higher education services that they need, but in this case, it is going to increase mandatory spending by \$73 billion—more than any of the appropriations bills we passed this year, except for our Defense Department Appropriations bill—and it is not going to be able to allow a single amendment on the floor of the House.

Now, that is just the process. That is the process that we have when we are dealing with tax bills, but my question for my colleagues is: Does mandatory spending deserve some additional scrutiny, the kind of scrutiny that we give to appropriated spending, to discretionary spending? I will tell you that it does. I am so proud of what this House does on discretionary spending.

My friend from Oklahoma happens to be an appropriator. He is an appropriations cardinal, in fact, which means he has leadership responsibilities over there. This committee comes to the Rules Committee—and my friend from Colorado recognizes this—they come to

the Rules Committee, and they ask for an open rule every single time.

They say: We have done the best we can do to give the House our proudest work, but if anybody else has ideas about how to improve it, come to us. We want this to be a collaborative product.

We can't do that with this bill before us today, and it increases mandatory spending by \$73.7 billion. I cannot count the number of times I have heard my colleagues in this body say it is not the appropriations spending that is the problem. It is the mandatory spending that is the problem.

We are moving awfully fast in the body this week to appropriate \$73.7 billion in new mandatory spending. I know people's hearts and heads are with these young people that we are trying to help get ahead, that we are trying to help access higher education, but there is only one place we are going to find this \$73.7 billion, and that is in the pocketbooks of those very same young men and women when we borrow this money today to spend it on them and ask them to pay it back, with interest in the future.

I caution my colleagues today, spending is a constitutional responsibility that we have. It is a constitutional responsibility that we have placed in the Appropriations Committee, where things are scrutinized line by line by line.

Never before this year has so much money gone out the door in so little amount of time, with so little input from the very capable Members on both sides of the aisle.

With that, again, I encourage my colleagues to read this rule. You will support this rule, but examine the underlying legislation carefully.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to take all this in. I certainly agree with his premise that we need to talk about mandatory spending. I think that there is a bipartisan desire to do that, and several years ago, there was a thoughtful Bowles-Simpson proposal that began to take on some of those issues.

I think that it is a discussion that—particularly when nondiscretionary spending is the vast majority of Federal spending, you can only do so much on the discretionary side, so it is very important to do that.

Clearly, all of these tax extenders and tax expenditures and mandatory spending through outlays and Social Security and Medicare, that is what that discussion is about. It is a very important one. This bill is yet another one that kicks the ball down the road, doesn't deal with any of those issues, and doesn't allow for any consideration of those issues.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to consider the Bring Jobs Home Act. This bill creates a new tax credit to provide an incentive for U.S. compa-

nies to move jobs from overseas back to America and will end the tax deductions for companies that outsource jobs.

Instead of considering two tax bills that hurt American families and bloat the deficit, let's consider one that brings American jobs home.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question, so that we can offer an amendment to consider my legislation, H.R. 851, the Bring Jobs Home Act. Yesterday, it passed in the Senate 93-7.

Now, there is something fundamentally wrong if we can't get a boost here, and it passes 93-7 across the board, Democrats and Republicans.

So what are we talking about here? An "aye" vote for the previous question is a vote to keep giving corporate America a tax break for every job they ship overseas to China. Let's start there.

Over the last few weeks, I heard a lot about corporate welfare in reference to the Export-Import Bank, before we debate it next week. It costs the government not one dime to help out the businesses. In fact, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) has 255,000 jobs in jeopardy in Oklahoma.

The Bring Jobs Home Act ends taxpayer writeoffs that pay moving costs when companies ship jobs abroad. We, as a body, have supported in the past giving money to businesses and corporations that send jobs overseas. That does not make sense.

What we want to do is to help those companies to come back because these are good-paying jobs. That is how manufacturing jobs primarily left this country.

Over the last 10 years, 2.4 million American jobs have been shipped overseas, and U.S. taxpayers have helped foot the bill. That, to me, is insanity. It is like paying someone for the rope they are going to hang you with.

Economists estimate that across the country, over 21 million jobs are at risk of being outsourced, 500,000 of them in my own home State of New Jersey.

At a time when we are trying to create good-paying manufacturing jobs in the United States, it quite simply makes no sense for the U.S. taxpayers to help foot the bill for companies that want to outsource jobs instead. My bill ends this taxpayer subsidy once and for all.

Instead, the Bring Jobs Home Act would provide a new 20 percent tax credit for companies that bring jobs back to the United States of America. This will provide a substantial incentive for more and more companies to create jobs and invest right here in our own country.

We are already seeing a trend towards insourcing. Manufacturing employment is up by 600,000 jobs since the

end of the Great Recession, and for the first time, in 2013, companies were reshoring jobs at the same rate that they offshored them. We have still got a big hole to dig ourselves out of from 2003, with up to 150,000 jobs being offshored each month. We are still out of balance by about 1 million jobs.

Companies like Master Lock, Caterpillar, Ford, GE, and Walmart even—which is not one of my favorites—are starting to see the value in bringing manufacturing back to this country. We have got the R&D, the infrastructure, the educated workforce, and we have got the consumers, and, again, we have the most productive workers in the world.

It is not just the big guys. More than 80 percent of companies bringing work back have \$200 million or less in sales, so let's give these companies a little extra incentive to make it in America by providing them with this tax credit to help our manufacturing economy continue its rebound.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. A robust manufacturing-based economy will lead to widespread prosperity for businesses and the people who work there. Manufacturing jobs pay 23 percent more than workers in other parts of the economy, and every \$1 in manufacturing sales creates \$1.40 worth of economic impact.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop the shortsighted policies that stifle investment here in America and focus on what we can do to incentivize investment and job creation. I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. COLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have opened quite a range of things to talk about with Mr. WOODALL's remarks and Mr. POLIS' response and my good friend from New Jersey, Mr. PASCRELL's proposal. Let me sort of take some of them up in order.

My friend from Colorado, who I know is sincere, talked a little bit about the need to reform entitlements, and I couldn't agree with him more, and that is a discussion I think we really, seriously need to engage in as a body.

I would invite my friend, if he has an opportunity, to look at a bipartisan bill that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY)—from his side of the aisle—and I have on Social Security reform.

It doesn't really deal with a lot of the reform, but it is a process bill. It would send us down the road to have a bipartisan proposal which, I can assure you, would have things that your side doesn't like and things that my side doesn't like, and then we would have to vote on it up or down.

I think it is a thoughtful way to try to begin to deal with some of these, and it is genuinely bipartisan, so I

would hope my friend from Colorado would look at that.

My friend from New Jersey mentioned the Ex-Im Bank. I couldn't agree with him more. I support it. I have consistently supported it, and I know there is a disagreement on our side of the aisle, I think, largely about that.

I hope that it is resolved in regular order—that is, that the committee votes on it and it comes down to the floor. When that happens, I look forward to working with my friend to enact that legislation.

I am intrigued by what my friend from New Jersey had to say about his tax proposal because I think, at the minimum, he has certainly put his finger on an important problem which is a real loophole that we ought to consider.

Now, I don't consider myself an expert on tax legislation. I am like my friend in the chair. I am an appropriator. That is the world I know. So I would hope that my friend's proposal would get appropriate consideration in our Ways and Means body and move through regular order because I think this is an area that we can cooperate on.

Frankly, we have got some bipartisan proposals in terms of stranded profits overseas that I think both sides could work together on, perhaps, and bring some investment back to our shores, but we do have to defend the process whereby we move legislation—that is it needs to come through the appropriate committee, we duly consider it, and it reaches here.

Again, while I may oppose the process by which my friend is moving, I am not at all prepared to say I oppose his product. I just simply haven't had a chance to look at it, but I think he is addressing an important issue.

The last area I do have to disagree with my friend on a little bit: I do like Walmart. I am a shopper at Walmart, and I am a stockholder at Walmart, and I think they are a great American company, but we live in a great country. My friend can shop where he chooses to, and I can shop where I choose to, and we will get down the road.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I don't have a Walmart near where I live, so I don't have that same choice.

I would add that I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I think the frustration around the process is we are open to any process of bringing forward the ideas that Mr. PASCRELL talked about to the floor, and we are presenting them in this context. There is a growing frustration on a number of issues, whether it is fixing our broken immigration system, whether it is extending unemployment, or whether it is how we are paying for these tax cuts. We want to avail our-

selves of every procedural opportunity for this House to consider the items that matter to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ENYART).

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for American jobs and good government. I rise to support the Bring Jobs Home Act.

Our current corporate tax law is broken. Today, companies that move American jobs overseas are able to take tax deductions for relocating jobs outside the United States. Let me say that again. Companies located here in the United States are able to take tax deductions for moving American jobs overseas.

Don't we have that backwards? Shouldn't we give tax deductions to those moving jobs back home, back to America? The Bring Jobs Home Act will provide for not only an end to company rewards for shipping jobs overseas, it will also provide companies an incentive to restore jobs in America.

Right in my home State of Illinois, over 690,000 jobs are at risk of being sent overseas. At a time when we are desperately trying to grow the job market in our country, we simply cannot, in good conscience, let the American taxpayer foot the moving bill for megacorporations.

When I was a young man, I worked the assembly line at Caterpillar, just like my father did. We put in a hard day's work for an honest day's pay. Caterpillar understood the importance of keeping jobs here in America. In the last few years, Caterpillar has been bringing jobs back to the U.S., back to my home State of Illinois, just like GE and Ford have. Let's give them the incentive they deserve for doing the right thing.

Join me in supporting this bill so we can bring jobs home.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I care to consume.

Again, I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, I frankly have no objection to my friends' using the process to bring these ideas up for debate and discussion. I actually think that is helpful and that moves the process forward, and I applaud them for that. I don't disagree necessarily with what they are talking about in terms of tax deductions for jobs that are exported as opposed to jobs that could be imported. I think that is something we ought to consider.

But, it is not the subject of the legislation that is in front of us today. Those subjects are, one, what can we do to modernize the Tax Code and give students permanent certainty in terms of tax deductions that are available to educate themselves and give their families the ability to deal a little bit with the mounting cost of college. That is a good idea. Both sides can broadly agree at least in principle. And what can we do to make sure the marriage penalty disappears and that we can target appropriate tax relief to families with

children at least up to a certain level of income, I believe \$150,000, to give them a little break with the cost of raising children.

Those, to me, are modest steps, but they are important programs because they affect the daily lives of American workers. I am not suggesting that what my friends are proposing doesn't do the same thing. I just think this vehicle, we probably ought to work within the bounds of what Ways and Means has sent us.

I will say, I sense some of my friend's frustration in terms of moving legislation. We have got 321 bills sitting in the United States Senate that haven't been acted upon that this House has sent over there, so I know a lot about feeling shut out. I think if our friends on our side of the aisle in the upper Chamber were here, they would tell you that they have had fewer amendments this year than Democrats in this Chamber have gotten on any appropriations bill that we have brought forward. We don't have a broken Congress. We have a broken United States Senate, in my view.

But, having said that, we have got a chance, I think, here to take a step in the right direction, to thoughtfully consider things that have worked their way through the Ways and Means Committee, to position this Chamber to sit down at a later point and negotiate with our friends—Republican and Democrat alike—in the other Chamber and perhaps produce, toward the end of this year, some good and permanent changes in the Tax Code that, if an agreement is reached, I suspect we could have overwhelming bipartisan support for.

So, we are just at that point in the process where we need to develop and put forward our proposals. We would hope that our counterparts in the United States Senate do the same thing, and that we can sit down and again find common ground in between. We have done that on some occasions before. If we will just operate the way our procedures are set up, I am confident we can do that again.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any remaining speakers.

Mr. COLE. I am certainly prepared to close whenever my friend is.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and this bill here before us today are yet another symbolic bill, and when this House only has another week in session before September, we are passing a bill that doesn't move here or there on the actual renewal of these tax credits, doesn't deal with the deficit or entitlement spending, and doesn't deal with immigration reform. It is a bill to presumably show the public that Republicans care about this particular tax credit as do, of course, Democrats.

But there is no real effort to figure out how we are going to pay for it. We would all love to cut every tax. Why not cut every tax down to zero and not tax anybody? But where is the money coming from?

It is the same with this. It is a feel-good, meaningless gesture that I, frankly, think the American people see through, which is why this body's approval rating hovers around 12 percent.

The bill makes in order the child tax credit improvement and costs \$115 billion over 10 years. Un-offset costs of this cost each taxpayer \$2,600.

Aside from the significant cost this imposes on the American people, there are also some substantive concerns that we talked about. While the bill would give some families a permanent tax break, it would actually harm our most vulnerable women and children. Specifically, the bill fails to extend a critical provision of CTC, which has helped low-income, working families lift themselves out of poverty.

The bill also indexes the current maximum credit of \$1,000 per child to inflation, which only benefits those with incomes high enough to receive the maximum benefit. Further, the bill extends the child tax credit up the income scale on a permanent basis, allowing only families who make over six figures to benefit.

Ironically, on the same day that Representative PAUL RYAN is unveiling his antipoverty plan, this particular proposal before us—which we are not allowed to offer our suggestions to amend under this closed rule—would actually push 12 million more people, including 6 million children, into poverty.

Unfortunately, there has been a provision added to this bill at the Rules Committee that would bar children who are American citizens but have immigrant parents from receiving the tax credit. This bill includes a provision that only allows the tax credit to be claimed if the taxpayer has a Social Security number, even if they are claiming the credit for children who have a Social Security number and are full American citizens.

This impact is huge. It would deny 5.5 million poor American children from being able to receive this tax credit, deny millions of U.S. citizens much-needed assistance for being able to afford their rent, clothing, and food just because of who their parents are. That is not right and that is not just.

It is no wonder that groups that care about this from across the ideological spectrum, including the National Women's Law Center, First Focus Campaign for Children, Half in Ten, Children's Defense Fund, National Immigration Law Center, and the National Council of La Raza, have all come out in strong opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it would be disgraceful if one of the only votes we took on immigration this year was to roll back benefits for U.S. citizens who happen to have parents who violated our law.

With 1 week left before the August recess, Republicans, unfortunately, have little time to introduce and pass a bill that actually deals with immigration and addresses the crisis at our border.

President Obama sent a request to Congress to address the increased flow of families and unaccompanied minors from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala across our border. As you know, these families that I had the opportunity to visit with this last weekend in McAllen, Texas, in San Antonio, at Lackland Air Force Base, are fleeing horrific situations, often including gangs, rape, murder, trafficking, and extreme poverty, and are seeking refuge in this great country just as my own great-grandparents did, as well as that of many of my colleagues.

This problem with the crisis at the southern border is only one of so many symptoms about our dysfunctional immigration system, which is why Congress needs to bring forward the bipartisan H.R. 15 bill for a vote and allow that to proceed to the Senate and President Obama's desk to resolve this crisis.

It is unconscionable to think that the only immigration-related legislation that the House actually may pass in the 113th Congress could be one aimed at cutting off benefits to American children or deporting children. We continue to fail to move any immigration reform bills to the floor this entire Congress. This body has already had the opportunity to act on legislation that passed the Senate by a bipartisan vote of more than two-thirds and that the President would sign.

H.R. 15, our House bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill, which I am a proud sponsor of, would create American jobs, ensure we are more competitive in a global economy, lower the deficit, reflect our values as Americans, unite families, secure our border, and restore some sense of normalcy and law to the chaos that now surrounds our immigration system.

The American people overwhelmingly support immigration reform, but, unfortunately, House Republicans continue to not allow a vote on reform and have failed to bring forward a bill to address the dire humanitarian crisis at our border. And here in this bill, we have another bill to cut off benefits to American kids just because of who their parents are.

I cannot support this closed rule and these underlying bills. They will add to our deficit. They fail to address some of the most critical issues of our time, and they have significant policy flaws that make these particular programs worse for some of our American families that need the credits the most.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me address a number of remarks my friend made in passing. Let me begin by reminding anybody who happens to be listening or following the debate this isn't an immigration bill. This is actually a tax bill, and it is really about trying to make some things that have had bipartisan support permanent.

We all agree that we need to, insofar as we can, help people that are educating themselves or members of their family and provide appropriate tax relief. That is what this bill does. It is simply that simple.

Number two, we all think that you shouldn't have a tax penalty for being married, and if we can do things to help you with the cost of raising a family, we ought to try and do those things because it has been tough. That is what this bill does.

Now, we can disagree about the merits, but I think the general thrust is something we probably broadly agree on. Making those items permanent within the Tax Code is important so people can actually get used to using the benefits, understand them—sort of internalize them—and make them permanent and predictable for families. So that is our goal with this legislation.

Finally, we would like to get, eventually, to a conference with our friends in the Senate who I suspect would share some of my friend from Colorado's concerns that might be in their legislation. He knows how the process works. We will sit down at that point and see if we can find common ground. If the two negotiating teams can, then I suspect we will come back with something that a great number of us on both sides of the aisle can support.

What my friend, Mr. CAMP, the chairman of Ways and Means, is trying to do is actually make permanent some very good bipartisan ideas that I think we can rally around.

Now, my friend also mentioned the deficit, and I want to, again, laud his concern for that. I appreciate that. I genuinely do. I recognize this is a work in progress, not a final product, but I will point out again for the record, when my friends were in the majority, the deficit got worse every single year. It has gotten lower every single year since then. So I think we are serious about dealing with the deficit.

I would invite my friend, and I know he would seriously engage in this, let's find some areas on the part of the budget that I think need addressing—the entitlement area—where perhaps we can find some common ground.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. There is no doubt that it takes both parties working together to dig the country into this much debt.

Mr. COLE. I do want to disagree with my friend on a couple of points.

Number one, this isn't a symbolic piece of legislation. It is legislation in progress, but it is not feel-good. I know Mr. CAMP and his committee are anxious to actually change many aspects of the Tax Code.

□ 1430

I know Mr. CAMP wants to make at least some of these things permanent. We may succeed or we may not, but it is certainly not meant to be anything other than serious.

Also, my friend mentioned and talked at considerable length about the issue of immigration and the border crisis, two issues that I regard as somewhat distinct. We do have a border crisis, and I suspect we will see legislation to deal with that. There is a difference in philosophy. I think the administration just wants resources to manage it. I think we would like to change some of the root causes and address it, and hopefully stop the massive flow and all of the human tragedy that goes with it.

There is a huge debate about what we do with unaccompanied juveniles or minors who arrive, and that is an important debate to have. But we ought to stop and think: Is there something that we are doing that is encouraging that flow? Because, believe me, everything that is coming out of this is bad. It disrupts the societies from which these people are coming. We are treating children from Mexico different than we are treating them from Guatemala. We have people now pouring money into criminal cartels and strengthening them. And finally, the children themselves, the juveniles themselves, are confronted with a thousand-mile long journey where they are breaking not just the laws here but also in Mexico. They are at great risk. They are traveling with criminals. There is a lot of abuse. Some of them are undoubtedly forced into sex trafficking and perhaps others to the drug trade. There are plenty of opportunities for abuse. Nobody should want that to happen.

We are going to try to offer some serious proposals. I am very pleased with my colleague on the Appropriations Committee, KAY GRANGER from Texas, who has put together a working group and some very thoughtful proposals. We have tried to scrub them on the Appropriations Committee. Hopefully we will be able to address that issue.

Finally, let me just end with this. In closing, I believe it is important, Mr. Speaker, to continue this deliberative approach towards fundamental tax reform. The child tax credit has existed since 1997, and the reforms contemplated in this legislation are important. In addition, the consolidation of four separate education credits into one simplified credit will result in much less taxpayer confusion.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 680 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 851) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 851.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the *Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives*, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend

the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 191, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Clawson (FL)	Foxx
Amash	Coble	Franks (AZ)
Amodel	Coffman	Frelinghuysen
Bachmann	Cole	Gardner
Bachus	Collins (GA)	Garrett
Barletta	Collins (NY)	Gerlach
Barr	Conaway	Gibbs
Barton	Cook	Gibson
Benishek	Cotton	Gohmert
Bentivolio	Cramer	Goodlatte
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gosar
Black	Crenshaw	Gowdy
Blackburn	Culberson	Granger
Boustany	Daines	Graves (GA)
Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Bridenstine	Denham	Griffin (AR)
Brooks (AL)	Dent	Griffith (VA)
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Grimm
Broun (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Guthrie
Buchanan	Duffy	Hall
Bucshon	Duncan (SC)	Hanna
Burgess	Duncan (TN)	Harper
Byrne	Ellmers	Harris
Calvert	Farenthold	Hartzler
Camp	Fincher	Hastings (WA)
Cantor	Fitzpatrick	Heck (NV)
Capito	Fleischmann	Hensarling
Carter	Fleming	Herrera Beutler
Cassidy	Flores	Holding
Chabot	Forbes	Hudson
Chaffetz	Fortenberry	Huelskamp

Huizenga (MI)	Miller (FL)	Schock
Hultgren	Miller (MI)	Schweikert
Hunter	Miller, Gary	Scott, Austin
Hurt	Mullin	Sensenbrenner
Issa	Mulvaney	Sessions
Jenkins	Murphy (PA)	Shimkus
Johnson (OH)	Neugebauer	Shuster
Johnson, Sam	Noem	Simpson
Jolly	Nugent	Smith (MO)
Jordan	Nunes	Smith (NE)
Joyce	Olson	Smith (NJ)
Kelly (PA)	Palazzo	Smith (TX)
King (IA)	Paulsen	Southerland
King (NY)	Pearce	Stewart
Kinzinger (IL)	Perry	Stivers
Kline	Petri	Stockman
Labrador	Pittenger	Stutzman
LaMalfa	Pitts	Terry
Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
Lance	Pompeo	Thornberry
Lankford	Posey	Tiberi
Latham	Price (GA)	Tipton
Latta	Reed	Turner
LoBiondo	Reichert	Upton
Long	Renacci	Valadao
Lucas	Ribble	Wagner
Luetkemeyer	Rice (SC)	Walberg
Lummis	Rigell	Walden
Marchant	Roby	Walorski
Marino	Roe (TN)	Weber (TX)
Massie	Rogers (AL)	Webster (FL)
Matheson	Rogers (KY)	Westrup
McAllister	Rohrabacher	Westmoreland
McCarthy (CA)	Rokita	Whitfield
McCaul	Rooney	Williams
McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (SC)
McHenry	Roskam	Wittman
McKeon	Ross	Wolf
McKinley	Rothfus	Womack
McMorris	Royce	Woodall
Rodgers	Runyan	Yoder
Meadows	Ryan (WI)	Yoho
Meehan	Salmon	Young (AK)
Messer	Sanford	Young (IN)
Mica	Scalise	

NAYS—191

Barber	Enyart	Luján, Ben Ray
Barrow (GA)	Eshoo	(NM)
Becerra	Esty	Lynch
Bera (CA)	Farr	Maffei
Bishop (GA)	Fattah	Maloney,
Bishop (NY)	Poster	Carolyn
Blumenauer	Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean
Bonamici	Fudge	Matsui
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	McCarthy (NY)
Braley (IA)	Gallego	McCollum
Brown (FL)	Garamendi	McDermott
Brownley (CA)	Garcia	McGovern
Bustos	Grayson	McIntyre
Butterfield	Green, Al	McNerney
Capps	Green, Gene	Meeks
Capuano	Grijalva	Meng
Cárdenas	Gutiérrez	Michaud
Carson (IN)	Hahn	Miller, George
Cartwright	Hastings (FL)	Moore
Castor (FL)	Higgins	Moran
Castro (TX)	Himes	Murphy (FL)
Chu	Hinojosa	Nadler
Cicilline	Holt	Napolitano
Clark (MA)	Horsford	Neal
Clarke (NY)	Hoyer	Negrete McLeod
Clay	Huffman	Nolan
Cleaver	Israel	O'Rourke
Clyburn	Jeffries	Owens
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Connolly	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell
Conyers	Jones	Pastor (AZ)
Cooper	Kaptur	Payne
Costa	Keating	Pelosi
Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter
Crowley	Kennedy	Peters (CA)
Cuellar	Kildee	Peters (MI)
Cummings	Kilmer	Peterson
Davis (CA)	Kind	Pingree (ME)
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Pocan
DeFazio	Kuster	Polis
DeGette	Langevin	Price (NC)
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Quigley
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Rahall
DelBene	Lee (CA)	Rangel
Levin	Levin	Richmond
Lipinski	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Loeb sack	Loeb sack	Ruiz
Lofgren	Lofgren	Ruppersberger
Lowenthal	Lowenthal	Rush
Lowe	Lowe	Ryan (OH)
Lujan Grisham	Lujan Grisham	Sánchez, Linda
(NM)	(NM)	T.

Sanchez, Loretta	Sires	Veasey
Sarbanes	Slaughter	Vela
Schakowsky	Smith (WA)	Velázquez
Schiff	Speier	Visclosky
Schneider	Swalwell (CA)	Walz
Schrader	Takano	Wasserman
Schwartz	Thompson (CA)	Schultz
Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)	Waters
Scott, David	Tierney	Waxman
Serrano	Titus	Welch
Sewell (AL)	Tonko	Wilson (FL)
Shea-Porter	Tsongas	Yarmuth
Sherman	Van Hollen	
Sinema	Vargas	

NOT VOTING—15

Bass	DesJarlais	Jackson Lee
Beatty	Gingrey (GA)	Kingston
Bishop (UT)	Hanabusa	Lewis
Campbell	Heck (WA)	Nunnelee
Carney	Honda	Rogers (MI)

□ 1501

Messrs. McNERNEY, GARCIA, and Ms. KUSTER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. WOODALL and COFFMAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately on July 24, 2014, I missed rollcall vote No. 442 on Ordering the Previous Question. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 189, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 443]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Cotton	Griffin (AR)
Amash	Cramer	Griffith (VA)
Amodel	Crawford	Grimm
Bachmann	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Bachus	Culberson	Hall
Barletta	Daines	Hanna
Barr	Davis, Rodney	Harper
Barton	Denham	Harris
Benishek	Dent	Hartzler
Bentivolio	DeSantis	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Black	Duffy	Hensarling
Blackburn	Duncan (SC)	Herrera Beutler
Boustany	Duncan (TN)	Holding
Brady (TX)	Ellmers	Hudson
Bridenstine	Farenthold	Huelskamp
Brooks (AL)	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Broun (GA)	Fleischmann	Hunter
Buchanan	Fleming	Hurt
Bucshon	Flores	Issa
Burgess	Forbes	Jenkins
Byrne	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Calvert	Foxx	Johnson, Sam
Camp	Franks (AZ)	Jolly
Cantor	Frelinghuysen	Jones
Carter	Gardner	Jordan
Cassidy	Garrett	Joyce
Chabot	Gerlach	Kelly (PA)
Chaffetz	Gibbs	King (IA)
	Gibson	King (NY)
	Gohmert	Kinzinger (IL)
	Goodlatte	Kline
	Gosar	Labrador
	Gowdy	LaMalfa
	Granger	Lamborn
	Graves (GA)	Lance
	Graves (MO)	Lankford

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 404, noes 14, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 444]

AYES—404

Aderholt	DeSantis	Johnson, Sam
Amash	Deuth	Jolly
Amodei	Diaz-Balart	Jones
Bachus	Dingell	Jordan
Barber	Doggett	Joyce
Barletta	Doyle	Kaptur
Barr	Duckworth	Keating
Barrow (GA)	Duffy	Kelly (IL)
Barton	Duncan (TN)	Kelly (PA)
Beatty	Edwards	Kennedy
Becerra	Ellison	Kildee
Benishek	Elmers	Kilmer
Bentivolio	Engel	Kind
Bera (CA)	Enyart	King (IA)
Bilirakis	Eshoo	King (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Esty	Kinzinger (IL)
Bishop (NY)	Farenthold	Kirkpatrick
Black	Farr	Kline
Blumenauer	Fattah	Kuster
Bonamici	Fincher	Labrador
Boustany	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn
Brady (PA)	Fleischmann	Lance
Brady (TX)	Fleming	Langevin
Braley (IA)	Flores	Lankford
Bridenstine	Forbes	Larsen (WA)
Brooks (IN)	Fortenberry	Larson (CT)
Brown (FL)	Foster	Latham
Brownley (CA)	Fox	Latta
Buchanan	Frankel (FL)	Lee (CA)
Bucshon	Franks (AZ)	Levin
Bustos	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Butterfield	Fudge	LoBiondo
Byrne	Gabbard	Loeb
Calvert	Galleo	Lofgren
Camp	Garamendi	Long
Cantor	Garcia	Lowenthal
Capps	Gardner	Lowe
Capuano	Garrett	Lucas
Cárdenas	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Carney	Gibbs	Lujan Grisham
Carson (IN)	Gibson	(NM)
Carter	Goodlatte	Lujan, Ben Ray
Cartwright	Gosar	(NM)
Cassidy	Gowdy	Lummis
Castor (FL)	Granger	Lynch
Castro (TX)	Graves (GA)	Maffei
Chabot	Graves (MO)	Maloney,
Chaffetz	Grayson	Carolyn
Chu	Green, Al	Maloney, Sean
Ciulline	Green, Gene	Marino
Clark (MA)	Griffin (AR)	Massie
Clarke (NY)	Griffith (VA)	Matheson
Clawson (FL)	Grijalva	Matsui
Clay	Grimm	McAllister
Cleaver	Guthrie	McCarthy (CA)
Clyburn	Gutiérrez	McCarthy (NY)
Coble	Hahn	McCauley
Coffman	Hall	McCollum
Cohen	Hanna	McDermott
Cole	Harper	McGovern
Collins (GA)	Harris	McHenry
Collins (NY)	Hartzel	McIntyre
Conaway	Hastings (FL)	McKeon
Connolly	Hastings (WA)	McKinley
Conyers	Heck (NV)	McMorris
Cook	Hensarling	Rodgers
Cooper	Herrera Beutler	McNerney
Costa	Higgins	Meadows
Cotton	Himes	Meehan
Courtney	Hinojosa	Meeks
Cramer	Holding	Meng
Crawford	Holt	Messer
Crenshaw	Horsford	Mica
Crowley	Hoyer	Michaud
Cuellar	Hudson	Miller (FL)
Culberson	Huelskamp	Miller, Gary
Cummings	Huffman	Miller, George
Daines	Huizenga (MI)	Moore
Davis (CA)	Hultgren	Moran
Davis, Danny	Hunter	Mullin
Davis, Rodney	Hurt	Mulvaney
DeFazio	Israel	Murphy (FL)
DeGette	Issa	Murphy (PA)
Delaney	Jeffries	Nadler
DeLauro	Jenkins	Napolitano
DeBene	Johnson (GA)	Neal
Denham	Johnson (OH)	Negrete McLeod
Dent	Johnson, E. B.	Neugebauer

Noem	Roskam	Stutzman
Nolan	Ross	Swalwell (CA)
Nugent	Rothfus	Takano
Nunes	Roybal-Allard	Terry
O'Rourke	Royce	Thompson (CA)
Olson	Ruiz	Thompson (MS)
Owens	Runyan	Thompson (PA)
Palazzo	Ruppersberger	Thornberry
Pallone	Rush	Tiberi
Pascarella	Ryan (OH)	Tierney
Pastor (AZ)	Ryan (WI)	Tipton
Paulsen	Salmon	Titus
Payne	Sánchez, Linda	Tonko
Pearce	T.	Tsongas
Pelosi	Sanchez, Loretta	Turner
Perlmutter	Sanford	Upton
Perry	Sarbanes	Valadao
Peters (CA)	Scalise	Van Hollen
Peters (MI)	Schakowsky	Vargas
Peterson	Schiff	Veasey
Petri	Schneider	Vela
Pingree (ME)	Schock	Velázquez
Pittenger	Schrader	Visclosky
Pitts	Schwartz	Wagner
Pocan	Schweikert	Walberg
Poe (TX)	Scott (VA)	Walden
Polis	Scott, Austin	Walorski
Pompeo	Scott, David	Walz
Posey	Sensenbrenner	Wasserman
Price (GA)	Serrano	Sessions
Price (NC)	Sewell (AL)	Waters
Quigley	Shea-Porter	Waxman
Rahall	Sherman	Webster (FL)
Rangel	Shimkus	Welch
Reed	Shuster	Wenstrup
Reichert	Simpson	Westmoreland
Renacci	Sinema	Whitfield
Ribble	Sires	Williams
Rice (SC)	Slaughter	Wilson (FL)
Richmond	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Rigell	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Roby	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Roe (TN)	Smith (TX)	Womack
Rogers (AL)	Smith (WA)	Woodall
Rogers (KY)	Southerland	Yarmuth
Rohrabacher	Speier	Yoder
Rokita	Stewart	Yoho
Rooney	Stivers	Young (IN)
Ros-Lehtinen		

NOES—14

Bachmann	Duncan (SC)	Miller (MI)
Blackburn	Gohmert	Stockman
Brooks (AL)	LaMalfa	Weber (TX)
Brown (GA)	Marchant	Young (AK)
Burgess	McClintock	

NOT VOTING—14

Bass	Gingrey (GA)	Kingston
Bishop (UT)	Hanabusa	Lewis
Campbell	Heck (WA)	Nunnelee
Capito	Honda	Rogers (MI)
DesJarlais	Jackson Lee	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1516

Mr. BURGESS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4984) to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 677, he reported the

bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TIERNEY. I am, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Tierney moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4984, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 16, line 2, strike "and" at the end.

Page 16, line 7, strike the period, close quotation marks, and semicolon at the end and insert "and".

Page 16, after line 7, insert the following:

"(xv) information on the anticipated monthly payment amount for each loan made to the borrower under part B, D, or E under, at a minimum, a standard repayment plan, if such loan were refinanced so that the applicable rate of interest on the loan is 2 percent lower than the applicable rate of interest on the loan as determined under section 455(b)(8).";

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It won't kill the bill, and it will not send it back to committee. If this amendment is adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, there are 5 legislative days remaining until this House recesses for the August district work period. It is unacceptable that the House would recess without taking meaningful action on one of the most important issues confronting students and parents and middle class families in my district in Massachusetts and all throughout the country—student loan debt.

Throughout this week, I have offered amendments and motions that provide student loan borrowers the opportunity to refinance their existing high-interest loans to a lower rate, much like homeowners and businesses are often able to do. It would help them save thousands of dollars over the life of

their loans. It would serve as an economic stimulus, as the savings generated from the refinanced loans would increase students' discretionary funds that would likely be reinvested and spent at local businesses, and it would help reduce the deficit.

It would also enable tens of millions of Americans to pursue their goals and move forward with their lives. I continue to hear from those whom I represent who share their personal stories. They tell me what a priority student loan refinancing is for them and their families.

A young woman from Reading, Massachusetts, emailed me this morning, and she said:

My husband and I, already struggling to make ends meet, scraped together enough money to make my loans current, but the payments are almost too much to bear. With the cost of living steadily rising and our incomes staying flat, it is becoming more and more difficult to provide for our family let alone pay back these loans at exorbitant rates. Being able to refinance them would be a godsend to myself and my family.

Another woman from Danvers, Massachusetts, emailed me today as well, and she said:

I am not looking for a magic solution to make my loans just disappear. It was my decision to take them out, and it is my responsibility to repay them, but lowering my interest rates would lower my monthly payments. I could breathe a little easier whenever my 9-year-old car makes a funny noise in knowing there is a little bit of cushion in my bank account for a mechanic. I could get my wisdom teeth out and still be able to afford to eat. I could finally start to think that maybe having a child just might be possible for me after all.

Mr. Speaker, these women are our customers, and this House should be in the business of serving their interests. Unfortunately, our Republican colleagues have denied or defeated all of our efforts to allow for student loan refinancing.

Mr. Speaker, we are not deterred, and we won't give up. We are here again today, fighting for students and their families. The motion I am offering today simply requires that students know what they would owe if they were permitted to refinance their loans just like consumers can do who refinance their mortgages right now.

Let's be clear. Voting against this motion is a vote to hide from students the significant benefits that refinancing would afford. Let's give them the information and allow them to decide for themselves if they, like the women I mentioned from Reading and Danvers, support student loan refinancing. I believe they do, Mr. Speaker, and I believe, if this were brought to the floor of the House, that we would have a majority in favor. I urge support for the motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, this proposal for a hypothetical refinancing interest rate would make financial understanding even more confusing. We have been working on a process here to make it easier for students and parents to understand their loans and grants and workstudy programs. This would not be helpful.

This motion, like all motions to recommit, affords the minority an opportunity to speak for 5 minutes to try to make political points before a procedural vote. That is done. Let's take the vote. Vote "no" on this and "yes" on the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 5111.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 220, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 445]

AYES—193

Barber	Delaney	Kelly (IL)
Barrow (GA)	DeLauro	Kennedy
Beatty	DelBene	Kildee
Becerra	Deutch	Kilmer
Bera (CA)	Dingell	Kind
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Kirkpatrick
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Kuster
Blumenauer	Duckworth	Langevin
Bonamici	Edwards	Larsen (WA)
Brady (PA)	Ellison	Larson (CT)
Braley (IA)	Engel	Lee (CA)
Brown (GA)	Enyart	Levin
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Lipinski
Brownley (CA)	Esty	Loebsack
Bustos	Farr	Lofgren
Butterfield	Fattah	Lowenthal
Capps	Foster	Lowe
Capuano	Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham
Cárdenas	Fudge	(NM)
Carney	Gabbard	Luján, Ben Ray
Carson (IN)	Galleo	(NM)
Cartwright	Garamendi	Lynch
Castor (FL)	Garcia	Maffei
Castro (TX)	Grayson	Maloney
Chu	Green, Al	Carolyn
Cicilline	Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean
Clark (MA)	Grijalva	Matheson
Clarke (NY)	Gutiérrez	Matsui
Clay	Hahn	McCarthy (NY)
Cleaver	Hastings (FL)	McCollum
Clyburn	Higgins	McDermott
Cohen	Himes	McGovern
Connolly	Hinojosa	McIntyre
Conyers	Holt	McNerney
Cooper	Horsford	Meeks
Costa	Hoyer	Meng
Courtney	Huffman	Michaud
Crowley	Israel	Miller, George
Cuellar	Jeffries	Moore
Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Moran
Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (FL)
Davis, Danny	Jones	Nadler
DeFazio	Kaptur	Napolitano
DeGette	Keating	Neal

Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger

Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier

Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
 Waxman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Bass	Heck (WA)	Nunnelee
Bishop (UT)	Honda	Pastor (AZ)
Campbell	Huizenga (MI)	Pelosi
Capito	Jackson Lee	Rogers (MI)
DesJarlais	Kingston	Wilson (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Lewis	
Hanabusa	McKeon	

□ 1532

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 405, noes 11, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 446]

AYES—405

Aderholt	Cole	Gallego
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Garamendi
Bachmann	Collins (NY)	Garcia
Bachus	Conaway	Gardner
Barber	Connolly	Garrett
Barletta	Conyers	Gerlach
Barr	Cook	Gibbs
Barrow (GA)	Cooper	Gibson
Barton	Costa	Goodlatte
Beatty	Cotton	Gosar
Becerra	Courtney	Gowdy
Benishek	Cramer	Granger
Bentivolio	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Bera (CA)	Crenshaw	Graves (MO)
Billirakis	Crowley	Grayson
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Green, Al
Bishop (NY)	Culberson	Green, Gene
Black	Cummings	Griffin (AR)
Blackburn	Daines	Griffith (VA)
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Grijalva
Bonamici	Davis, Danny	Grimm
Boustany	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Gutiérrez
Brady (TX)	DeGette	Hahn
Braley (IA)	Delaney	Hall
Bridenstine	DeLauro	Hanna
Brooks (AL)	DelBene	Harper
Brooks (IN)	Denham	Harris
Brown (FL)	Dent	Hartzler
Brownley (CA)	DeSantis	Hastings (FL)
Bucshon	Deutch	Hastings (WA)
Burgess	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Bustos	Dingell	Hensarling
Butterfield	Doggett	Herrera Beutler
Byrne	Doyle	Higgins
Calvert	Duckworth	Himes
Camp	Duffy	Hinojosa
Cantor	Duncan (TN)	Holding
Capps	Edwards	Holt
Capuano	Ellison	Horsford
Cárdenas	Ellmers	Hoyer
Carney	Engel	Hudson
Carson (IN)	Enyart	Huelskamp
Carter	Eshoo	Huffman
Cartwright	Esty	Huizenga (MI)
Cassidy	Farenthold	Hultgren
Castor (FL)	Farr	Hunter
Castro (TX)	Fattah	Hurt
Chabot	Fincher	Israel
Chaffetz	Fitzpatrick	Issa
Chu	Fleischmann	Jeffries
Cicilline	Fleming	Jenkins
Clark (MA)	Flores	Johnson (GA)
Clarke (NY)	Forbes	Johnson (OH)
Clay	Fortenberry	Johnson, E. B.
Cleaver	Foster	Johnson, Sam
Clyburn	Foxo	Jolly
Cohen	Frankel (FL)	Jones
Connolly	Franks (AZ)	Jordan
Conyers	Frelinghuysen	Joyce
Cooper	Fudge	Kaptur
Costa	Gabbard	Keating

NOES—220

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Lee (CA)
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry

Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Kelly (IL)	Mulvaney	Schrader
Kelly (PA)	Murphy (FL)	Schwartz
Kennedy	Murphy (PA)	Schweikert
Kildee	Nadler	Scott (VA)
Kilmer	Napolitano	Scott, Austin
Kind	Neal	Scott, David
King (IA)	Negrete McLeod	Sensenbrenner
King (NY)	Neugebauer	Serrano
Kinzinger (IL)	Noem	Sessions
Kirkpatrick	Nolan	Sewell (AL)
Kline	Nugent	Shea-Porter
Kuster	Nunes	Sherman
Labrador	O'Rourke	Shimkus
LaMalfa	Olson	Shuster
Lamborn	Owens	Simpson
Lance	Palazzo	Sinema
Langevin	Pallone	Sires
Larsen (WA)	Pascrell	Slaughter
Larson (CT)	Paulsen	Smith (MO)
Latham	Payne	Smith (NE)
Latta	Pearce	Smith (NJ)
Lee (CA)	Perlmutter	Smith (TX)
Levin	Perry	Smith (WA)
Lipinski	Peters (CA)	Southerland
LoBiondo	Peters (MI)	Speier
Loeb sack	Peterson	Stewart
Lofgren	Petri	Stivers
Long	Pingree (ME)	Stutzman
Lowenthal	Pittenger	Swalwell (CA)
Lowey	Pitts	Takano
Lucas	Pocan	Terry
Luetkemeyer	Polis	Thompson (CA)
Lujan Grisham	Pompeo	Thompson (MS)
(NM)	Posey	Thompson (PA)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Price (GA)	Thornberry
(NM)	Price (NC)	Tiberi
Lummis	Quigley	Tierney
Lynch	Rahall	Tipton
Maffei	Rangel	Titus
Maloney,	Reed	Tonko
Carolyn	Reichert	Tsongas
Maloney, Sean	Renacci	Turner
Marchant	Ribble	Upton
Marino	Rice (SC)	Valadao
Massie	Richmond	Van Hollen
Matheson	Rigell	Vargas
Matsui	Roby	Veasey
McAllister	Roe (TN)	Vela
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Velázquez
McCarthy (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Visclosky
McCauley	Rohrabacher	Wagner
McCollum	Rokita	Walberg
McDermott	Rooney	Walden
McGovern	Ros-Lehtinen	Walorski
McHenry	Roskam	Walz
McIntyre	Ross	Wasserman
McKeon	Rothfus	Schultz
McKinley	Roybal-Allard	Waters
McMorris	Royce	Waxman
Rodgers	Ruiz	Webster (FL)
McNerney	Runyan	Welch
Meadows	Ruppersberger	Wenstrup
Meehan	Rush	Whitfield
Meeks	Ryan (OH)	Williams
Meng	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (FL)
Messer	Salmon	Wilson (SC)
Mica	Sánchez, Linda	Wittman
Michaud	T.	Wolf
Miller (FL)	Sánchez, Loretta	Womack
Miller (MI)	Sarbanes	Woodall
Miller, Gary	Scalise	Yarmuth
Miller, George	Schakowsky	Yoder
Moore	Schiff	Yoho
Moran	Schneider	Young (AK)
Mullin	Schock	Young (IN)

NOES—11

Amash	Lankford	Stockman
Broun (GA)	McClintock	Weber (TX)
Duncan (SC)	Poe (TX)	Westmoreland
Gohmert	Sanford	

NOT VOTING—16

Bass	Hanabusa	Nunnelee
Bishop (UT)	Heck (WA)	Pastor (AZ)
Campbell	Honda	Pelosi
Capito	Jackson Lee	Rogers (MI)
DesJarlais	Kingston	
Gingrey (GA)	Lewis	

□ 1539

Mr. PAYNE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 445 and 446, I was delayed at the office. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The SPEAKER tempore. Pursuant to the Chair's announcement of earlier today, the House will now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

Will all present please rise for a moment of silence.

ANNIVERSARY OF DEATHS OF CAPITOL POLICE OFFICERS JOHN GIBSON AND JACOB CHESTNUT

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think it appropriate that one of us rise to recognize the sacrifice made by Detective Gibson and Officer Chestnut. Detective Gibson was in the office of Tom DeLay. Officer Chestnut was at the memorial door allowing visitors to come in. He was shot in the back of the head. Detective Gibson was trying to protect not only the then-Majority Leader DeLay but also other members of the staff and of the public. They did what we expect them to do, and they paid for that with their lives.

All of us, I know, express our deep gratitude to the members of the Capitol Police force, who every day get out of bed and strap on a gun, put a badge to their chest or in their wallet or on their person, and come to this Capitol to defend not only the Members and the staff but the millions of people who come to visit the Capitol of the United States regularly. They allow us to have confidence that we can do the people's business in safety and security.

So not only is it appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that we pay tribute to Detective Gibson and Officer Chestnut, but also to give thanks to those who serve daily that this Capitol might operate on behalf of the American people.

ANNIVERSARY OF DEATHS OF CAPITOL POLICE OFFICERS JOHN GIBSON AND JACOB CHESTNUT

(Mr. REICHERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of Mr. HOYER.

As most of you know in this Chamber, my previous career was in law enforcement, 33 years. And there are some Members in here who have served their community as a police officer.

In my experience in 33 years, I felt the pain of the loss of a partner and a best friend. I felt the pain of the loss of

a neighbor and a very good friend and academy graduate friend.

As the sheriff, I lost officers during my term, 8 years as sheriff in Seattle.

I appreciate the time that we take today to honor those who have died to protect Members of this body, and to recognize all of those law enforcement officers across the country, across the world, for that matter, who are protecting us each and every day.

But I think one of the most important things we can do, ladies and gentlemen, is not only remember them and their service, but remember their families. Their families lost a husband. They lost a father, a brother, an uncle, a grandpa.

This is real life-and-death stuff that these folks face every day.

□ 1545

MENTAL ILLNESS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to add my comments. For those of us who were here that tragic day, the perpetrator of that horrendous act was a schizophrenic who was off his medicine, untreated, and drove three-quarters of the way across this country to commit those heinous crimes.

Before this House today are two bills, one authored by a Republican from Pennsylvania, TIM MURPHY, and another authored by a Democrat from Arizona, RON BARBER.

All these years have passed, and we have never yet brought to this floor a measure that would make a difference in this country for those who suffer with mental illness and some of whom, unfortunately, obtain weapons.

I believe that we have a moment in this House to do something exceptional, and I hope it can happen in this Congress.

MISSING CHILDREN'S ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5111) to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 447]

YEAS—409

Aderholt	Duckworth	King (NY)
Amash	Duffy	Kinzinger (IL)
Amodi	Duncan (SC)	Kirkpatrick
Bachmann	Duncan (TN)	Kline
Bachus	Edwards	Kuster
Barber	Ellison	Labrador
Barletta	Ellmers	LaMalfa
Barr	Engel	Lamborn
Barrow (GA)	Enyart	Lance
Beatty	Eshoo	Langevin
Becerra	Esty	Lankford
Benishek	Farenthold	Larsen (WA)
Bentivolio	Farr	Larson (CT)
Bera (CA)	Fattah	Latham
Bilirakis	Fincher	Latta
Bishop (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Lee (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Fleming	Levin
Black	Flores	Lipinski
Blackburn	Forbes	LoBiondo
Blumenauer	Fortenberry	Loeb
Bonamici	Foster	Lofgren
Boustany	Fox	Long
Brady (PA)	Frankel (FL)	Lowe
Brady (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Braley (IA)	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Bridenstine	Fudge	Lujan Grisham
Brooks (AL)	Gabbard	(NM)
Brooks (IN)	Gallagher	Lujan, Ben Ray
Broun (GA)	Garamendi	(NM)
Brown (FL)	Garcia	Lummis
Brownley (CA)	Gardner	Lynch
Buchanan	Garrett	Maffei
Bucshon	Gerlach	Maloney
Burgess	Gibbs	Carolyn
Bustos	Gibson	Maloney, Sean
Butterfield	Gohmert	Marchant
Byrne	Goodlatte	Marino
Calvert	Gosar	Massie
Camp	Gowdy	Matheson
Cantor	Granger	Matsui
Capps	Graves (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Capuano	Graves (MO)	McCarthy (NY)
Cardenas	Grayson	McCaul
Carney	Green, Al	McClintock
Carson (IN)	Green, Gene	McCollum
Carter	Griffin (AR)	McDermott
Cartwright	Griffith (VA)	McGovern
Cassidy	Grijalva	McHenry
Castor (FL)	Grimm	McIntyre
Castro (TX)	Guthrie	McKeon
Chabot	Gutiérrez	McKinley
Chaffetz	Hahn	McMorris
Chu	Hall	Rodgers
Cicilline	Hanna	McNerney
Clark (MA)	Harper	Meadows
Clarke (NY)	Harris	Meehan
Clawson (FL)	Hartzler	Meeks
Clay	Hastings (FL)	Meng
Cleaver	Hastings (WA)	Messer
Clyburn	Heck (NV)	Mica
Coble	Hensarling	Michaud
Coffman	Herrera Beutler	Miller (FL)
Cohen	Higgins	Miller (MI)
Cole	Himes	Miller, Gary
Collins (GA)	Hinojosa	Miller, George
Collins (NY)	Holding	Moore
Conaway	Holt	Moran
Connolly	Horsford	Mullin
Conyers	Hoyer	Mulvaney
Cook	Hudson	Murphy (FL)
Cooper	Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)
Costa	Huffman	Nadler
Cotton	Huizenga (MI)	Napolitano
Courtney	Hultgren	Neal
Cramer	Hurt	Negrete McLeod
Crawford	Israel	Neugebauer
Crenshaw	Issa	Noem
Crowley	Jeffries	Nolan
Cuellar	Jenkins	Nugent
Culberson	Johnson (GA)	Nunes
Cummings	Johnson (OH)	O'Rourke
Daines	Johnson, E. B.	Olson
Davis, Danny	Johnson, Sam	Owens
DeFazio	Jolly	Palazzo
DeGette	Jones	Pallone
Delaney	Jordan	Pascarelli
DeLauro	Joyce	Pastor (AZ)
DelBene	Kaptur	Paulsen
Denham	Keating	Payne
Dent	Kelly (IL)	Pearce
DeSantis	Kelly (PA)	Perlmutter
Deutch	Kennedy	Perry
Diaz-Balart	Kildee	Peters (CA)
Dingell	Kilmer	Peters (MI)
Doggett	Kind	Peterson
Doyle	King (IA)	Petri

Pittenger	Sarbanes	Tierney
Pitts	Scalise	Tipton
Pocan	Schakowsky	Titus
Poe (TX)	Schiff	Tonko
Polis	Schneider	Tsongas
Pompeo	Schock	Turner
Posey	Schrader	Upton
Price (GA)	Schwartz	Valadao
Price (NC)	Schweikert	Van Hollen
Quigley	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Rahall	Scott, Austin	Veasey
Rangel	Scott, David	Vela
Reed	Sensenbrenner	Velázquez
Reichert	Serrano	Visclosky
Renacci	Sessions	Wagner
Ribble	Sewell (AL)	Walberg
Rice (SC)	Shea-Porter	Walden
Richmond	Sherman	Walorski
Rigell	Shimkus	Walz
Roby	Shuster	Wasserman
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Schultz
Rogers (AL)	Sinema	Waters
Rogers (KY)	Sires	Waxman
Rohrabacher	Slaughter	Weber (TX)
Rokita	Smith (MO)	Webster (FL)
Rooney	Smith (NE)	Welch
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Wenstrup
Roskam	Smith (TX)	Westmoreland
Ross	Smith (WA)	Whitfield
Rothfus	Southerland	Williams
Royal-Allard	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Royce	Stewart	Wilson (SC)
Ruiz	Stivers	Wittman
Runyan	Stockman	Wolf
Ruppersberger	Stutzman	Womack
Rush	Swalwell (CA)	Woodall
Ryan (OH)	Takano	Yarmuth
Ryan (WI)	Terry	Yoder
Salmon	Thompson (CA)	Yoho
Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (MS)	Young (AK)
T.	Thompson (PA)	Young (IN)
Sanchez, Loretta	Thornberry	
Sanford	Tiberi	

NOT VOTING—23

Barton	Fleischmann	Lewis
Bass	Gingrey (GA)	Lowenthal
Bishop (UT)	Hanabusa	McAllister
Campbell	Heck (WA)	Nunnelee
Capito	Honda	Pelosi
Davis (CA)	Hunter	Pingree (ME)
Davis, Rodney	Jackson Lee	Rogers (MI)
DesJarlais	Kingston	

□ 1553

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDENT AND FAMILY TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 680, I call up the bill (H.R. 3393) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to consolidate certain tax benefits for educational expenses, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 680, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 113-552 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3393

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Student and Family Tax Simplification Act”.

SEC. 2. CONSOLIDATION OF CERTAIN TAX BENEFITS FOR EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES.

(a) AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT.—Section 25A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 25A. AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, with respect to each eligible student, an amount equal to the sum of—

“(1) 100 percent of so much of the qualified tuition and related expenses paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year (for education furnished to the eligible student during any academic period beginning in such taxable year) as does not exceed \$2,000, plus

“(2) 25 percent of so much of such expenses so paid as exceeds the dollar amount in effect under paragraph (1) but does not exceed twice such dollar amount.

“(b) PORTION OF CREDIT REFUNDABLE.—So much of the credit allowable under subsection (a) with respect to each eligible student (determined without regard to this subsection and section 26(a) and after application of all other provisions of this section) as does not exceed \$1,500 shall be treated as a credit allowable under subpart C (and not under this part). The preceding sentence shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year if such taxpayer is a child to whom section 1(g) applies for such taxable year.

“(c) LIMITATION BASED ON MODIFIED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount allowable as a credit under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall be reduced (but not below zero) by an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so allowable (determined without regard to this subsection and subsection (b) but after application of all other provisions of this section) as—

“(A) the excess of—

“(i) the taxpayer’s modified adjusted gross income for such taxable year, over

“(ii) \$80,000 (twice such amount in the case of a joint return), bears to

“(B) \$10,000 (twice such amount in the case of a joint return).

“(2) MODIFIED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘modified adjusted gross income’ means the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for the taxable year increased by any amount excluded from gross income under section 911, 931, or 933.

“(d) OTHER LIMITATIONS.—No credit shall be allowed under this section with respect to any eligible student for any taxable year if—

“(1) such student was taken into account in determining the credit allowed under this section (by the taxpayer or any other individual) for any 4 prior taxable years, or

“(2) such student has completed (before the beginning of such taxable year) the first 4 years of postsecondary education at an eligible educational institution.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) ELIGIBLE STUDENT.—The term ‘eligible student’ means, with respect to any academic period, a student who—

“(A) meets the requirements of section 484(a)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(a)(1)), as in effect on August 5, 1997, and

“(B) is carrying at least ½ the normal full-time work load for the course of study the student is pursuing.

“(2) QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified tuition and related expenses’ means tuition,

fees, and course materials, required for enrollment or attendance of—

“(i) the taxpayer,

“(ii) the taxpayer’s spouse, or

“(iii) any dependent of the taxpayer with respect to whom the taxpayer is allowed a deduction under section 151, at an eligible educational institution for courses of instruction of such individual at such institution.

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR EDUCATION INVOLVING SPORTS, ETC.—Such term does not include expenses with respect to any course or other education involving sports, games, or hobbies, unless such course or other education is part of the individual’s degree program.

“(C) EXCEPTION FOR NONACADEMIC FEES.—Such term does not include student activity fees, athletic fees, insurance expenses, or other expenses unrelated to an individual’s academic course of instruction.

“(3) ELIGIBLE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘eligible educational institution’ means an institution—

“(A) which is described in section 481 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1088), as in effect on August 5, 1997, and

“(B) which is eligible to participate in a program under title IV of such Act.

“(f) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) to a taxpayer with respect to the qualified tuition and related expenses of an individual unless the taxpayer includes the name and taxpayer identification number of such individual, and the employer identification number of any institution to which such expenses were paid, on the return of tax for the taxable year.

“(2) ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS, ETC.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount of qualified tuition and related expenses otherwise taken into account under subsection (a) with respect to an individual for an academic period shall be reduced (before the application of subsection (c)) by the sum of any amounts paid for the benefit of such individual which are allocable to such period as—

“(i) a qualified scholarship which is excludable from gross income under section 117,

“(ii) an educational assistance allowance under chapter 30, 31, 32, 34, or 35 of title 38, United States Code, or under chapter 1606 of title 10, United States Code, and

“(iii) a payment (other than a gift, bequest, devise, or inheritance within the meaning of section 102(a)) for such individual’s educational expenses, or attributable to such individual’s enrollment at an eligible educational institution, which is excludable from gross income under any law of the United States.

“(B) COORDINATION WITH PELL GRANTS NOT USED FOR QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the amount of any Federal Pell Grant under section 401 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount of expenses (other than qualified tuition and related expenses) which are taken into account in determining the cost of attendance (as defined in section 472 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this paragraph) of such individual at an eligible educational institution for the academic period for which the credit under this section is being determined.

“(3) TREATMENT OF EXPENSES PAID BY DEPENDENT.—If a deduction under section 151 with respect to an individual is allowed to another taxpayer for a taxable year beginning in the calendar year in which such individual’s taxable year begins—

“(A) no credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) to such individual for such individual’s taxable year, and

“(B) qualified tuition and related expenses paid by such individual during such individual’s taxable year shall be treated for purposes of this section as paid by such other taxpayer.

“(4) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PREPAYMENTS.—If qualified tuition and related expenses are paid by the taxpayer during a taxable year for an academic period which begins during the first 3 months following such taxable year, such academic period shall be treated for purposes of this section as beginning during such taxable year.

“(5) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—No credit shall be allowed under this section for any amount for which a deduction is allowed under any other provision of this chapter.

“(6) NO CREDIT FOR MARRIED INDIVIDUALS FILING SEPARATE RETURNS.—If the taxpayer is a married individual (within the meaning of section 7703), this section shall apply only if the taxpayer and the taxpayer’s spouse file a joint return for the taxable year.

“(7) NONRESIDENT ALIENS.—If the taxpayer is a nonresident alien individual for any portion of the taxable year, this section shall apply only if such individual is treated as a resident alien of the United States for purposes of this chapter by reason of an election under subsection (g) or (h) of section 6013.

“(g) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2018, the \$2,000 amount in subsection (a)(1), the \$1,500 amount in subsection (b), and the \$80,000 amount in subsection (c)(1)(A)(ii) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

“(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2017’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(2) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under paragraph (1) is not a multiple of \$100 (\$1,000 in the case of the amount in subsection (c)(1)(A)(ii)), such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$100 (\$1,000 in the case of the amount in subsection (c)(1)(A)(ii)).

“(h) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such regulations or other guidance as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out this section, including regulations providing for a recapture of the credit allowed under this section in cases where there is a refund in a subsequent taxable year of any amount which was taken into account in determining the amount of such credit.”.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO REPORT TUITION PAID RATHER THAN TUITION BILLED.—Section 6050S(b)(2)(B)(i) is amended by striking “or the aggregate amount billed”.

(c) REPEAL OF DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking section 222 (and by striking the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such part).

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 62(a) of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (18).

(2) Section 72(t)(7)(B) of such Code is amended by striking “section 25A(g)(2)” and inserting “section 25A(f)(2)”.

(3) Sections 86(b)(2)(A), 135(c)(4)(A), 137(b)(3)(A), 199(d)(2)(A), 219(g)(3)(A)(ii), and 221(b)(2)(C)(i) of such Code are each amended by striking “222.”.

(4) Section 469(i)(3)(F)(iii) of such Code is amended by striking “221, and 222” and inserting “and 221”.

(5) Section 529(c)(3)(B)(v)(I) of such Code is amended by striking “section 25A(g)(2)” and inserting “section 25A(f)(2)”.

(6) Section 529(e)(3)(B)(i) of such Code is amended by striking “section 25A(b)(3)” and inserting “section 25A(d)”.

(7) Section 530(d)(2)(C) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “section 25A(g)(2)” in clause (i)(I) and inserting “section 25A(f)(2)”, and

(B) by striking “HOPE AND LIFETIME LEARNING CREDITS” in the heading and inserting “AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT”.

(8) Section 530(d)(4)(B)(iii) of such Code is amended by striking “section 25A(g)(2)” and inserting “section 25A(d)(4)(B)”.

(9) Section 6050S(e) of such Code is amended by striking “subsection (g)(2)” and inserting “subsection (f)(2)”.

(10) Section 6211(b)(4)(A) of such Code is amended by striking “subsection (i)(6)” and inserting “subsection (b)”.

(11) Section 6213(g)(2)(J) of such Code is amended by striking “TIN required under section 25A(g)(1)” and inserting “TIN, and employer identification number, required under section 25A(f)(1)”.

(12) Section 1004(c) of division B of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Tax Act of 2009 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “section 25A(i)(6)” each place it appears and inserting “section 25A(b)”,

(ii) by striking “with respect to taxable years beginning after 2008 and before 2018” in subparagraph (A) and inserting “with respect to each taxable year”, and

(iii) by striking “for taxable years beginning after 2008 and before 2018” in subparagraph (B) and inserting “for each taxable year”.

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “Section 25A(i)(6)” and inserting “Section 25A(b)”, and

(C) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking “subsection (i)(6)” and inserting “subsection (b)”.

(13) The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the item relating to section 25A and inserting the following new item:

“Sec. 25A. American opportunity tax credit.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF PELL GRANT EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 117(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking the period at the end and inserting “, or”,

(2) by striking “received by an individual as a scholarship” and inserting the following: “received by an individual—

“(A) as a scholarship”, and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) as a Federal Pell Grant under section 401 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3393.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, more and more Americans are pursuing the dream of earning a college degree, but for many, realizing that dream is getting more difficult. Tuition prices continue to climb, making it harder for Americans to plan for and afford a higher education. Worse yet, our broken Tax Code makes it harder than ever to pay for it.

Currently, there are 15 complicated and, at times, overlapping education provisions that include over 90 pages of IRS instructions. Students and parents alike are already juggling busy schedules as is, and they shouldn't be forced to go through 90 pages of IRS explanations just to figure out the best way to save and pay for a college education.

We need a simple solution that makes it easier to qualify for tax relief and to ultimately afford college. We owe it to the millions of young adults paying their way through college and the families who budget every year to save for their children's education to simplify the system and help make a good education affordable.

The bill before us, H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act, would do just that. This legislation will make paying for college easier, by combining and making more efficient four tax benefits for higher education into a new, simpler, and more valuable American opportunity tax credit, and this new, improved credit will provide greater benefits for those who need it most.

I am proud that this bipartisan provision is based off of years of work by the Ways and Means Committee and, in particular, committee members DIANE BLACK of Tennessee and DANNY DAVIS of Illinois, the cochairs of the Education and Family Benefits Tax Reform Working Group, who worked across the aisle to help simplify the Code.

I should also note that the Obama administration has expressed support for an approach that assumes a permanent extension of the AOTC. We have a real opportunity today to work across the aisle to make life better for hard-working Americans.

By consolidating the current American opportunity tax credit, the Hope Scholarship credit, the lifetime learning credit, and the college tuition deduction into one simplified AOTC cred-

it, college students can get the help they need without navigating almost 100 pages of forms.

The bill would provide a permanent 100 percent tax credit for the first \$2,000 of certain higher education expenses and a 25 percent tax credit for the next \$2,000 of expenses.

The first \$1,500 of the credit is refundable, ensuring that students get the benefits, regardless of tax liability. This can go a long way for students and their families, especially in these tough economic times.

The American Association of Community Colleges and the Association of Community College Trustees, who cite the AOTC as the most important source of support for college students in the Tax Code, recently voiced their support for this bill, stating, "The legislation achieves several important objectives for the Nation's college students, who continue to face substantial financing challenges, even at low-cost community colleges. Its simplification of the current array of higher education tax benefits is critical, given that their complexity has led to widespread underutilization."

Additionally, this provision would allow Pell grants to be used for a wider array of expenses, including room and board, without triggering additional tax liability. Not only does this provision have widespread bipartisan support, but a postelection poll found that over 80 percent of Americans support extending these policies.

No one should be discouraged from pursuing continued learning, but because tuition prices continue to climb while wages continue to fall, families and students nationwide are wondering if they can even afford it.

□ 1600

Today we can do better. We can do better by these hardworking Americans. I encourage my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to move this bill through the House and ask for both the Senate and the administration to work with us in finding simple, common-sense solutions like these for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What Republicans are, in essence, trying to do here and elsewhere, if I might say so today, is to soften their image. But they can't run away from the hard reality that at every turn, over the last several years, they have sought to pass laws making life more difficult for middle- and low-income families.

On the Republican chopping block, unemployment insurance blocked for 3 million Americans. Food assistance for low-income Americans would be cut by nearly 20 percent in the Ryan Republican budget, and a minimum wage increase hasn't occurred in 5 years, yet Republicans refuse to provide an increase. Medical assistance for Ameri-

cans would be slashed by the Ryan Republican budget, with funding for Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program cut to the tune of 26 percent within 10 years. Social Services Block Grants, which provide flexible funds for States to help vulnerable populations, are eliminated under the Ryan Republican budget. Pell grants would be reduced by 400,000 under the Ryan Republican budget. Job training funding was targeted for deep cuts in the 2011 spending bill the House Republicans passed, and housing assistance would end for 800,000 low-income families in the Transportation-HUD Appropriations bill House Republicans just passed.

Indeed, hard-hearted actions contradict the soft rhetoric of today. We should be very skeptical when zebras try to change their stripes.

Today's legislation is part of a set of 14 tax provisions that Ways and Means Republicans have marked up and made permanent without offsets at a cost of \$825 billion to taxpayers. By the end of this week, the total that House Republicans will have passed on the floor is more than \$700 billion, not a dime offset. It is kind of easy to come here and say this is what we want to do when we don't pay a dime to do it.

Let it be clear in terms of this call on bipartisanship. All the Democrats on Ways and Means voted against this bill, and the Statement of Administration Policy says it opposes it. Let me give some details.

In simplifying education provisions within the Tax Code, this bill leaves behind numerous undergraduate students, graduate students, and lifetime learners. It replaces the Hope Scholarship credit and repeals both the lifetime learning credit and the now-expired deduction for qualified tuition expenses, and it limits the overall deduction for the first 4 years of schooling.

It harms students across the board. Undergraduates who take longer than 4 years to complete their degrees would be impacted, a change that loses sight of the fact that the median length of time that it takes undergrads to get their degrees is, today, more than 4 years. Adult learners would face higher costs. Three in four students are adult learners, who tend to take much longer to complete their degrees because they work full-time, have dependents, serve in the military, or have some combination of the foregoing and take longer to complete their degree.

Low-income and middle-income graduate students would lose out. In 2013, the lifetime learning credit, which this bill eliminates, served nearly 2 million students with incomes at or below \$75,000, including 1 million with an income of \$40,000 or less. Two years ago, one-quarter of all graduate students earned less than \$11,000. During the same year, 31 percent of the 1.3 million master's degree students received no financial aid. Two years ago, one-quarter—one-quarter—of all graduate students earned less than \$11,000. During

the same year, 31 percent of the 1.3 million master's degree students received no financial aid. In 2011, nearly 2 million tax returns claimed the qualified tuition deduction, which expired at the end of this year and this bill does not extend.

That is one reason we have a letter from the American Council on Education. Here is what they say:

However, as we discussed in our attached letter of April 4, 2014, to Ways and Means Committee members, there are a number of other changes in the legislation which cause us great concern. Even as reported, the bill would negatively impact many low- and middle-income students and families who benefit under current law. It also would harm graduate students and lifetime learners who utilize the tuition deduction or the LLC. Because we continue to have serious concerns about the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act, we cannot support—we cannot support—the bill as currently written, even in the form as reported.

This is sent on behalf of the following: the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Council on Education, the Association of American Universities, the Association of Governing Boards, the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, College and University Professional Association for Human Resources, the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities, the Council of Graduate Schools, and the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities.

That letter so much speaks to this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I insert in the RECORD letters of support for the legislation from the American Association of Community Colleges and the Association of Community College Trustees, as well as the United States Student Association.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES, ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEES,

July 21, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) and the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT), which represent the nation's more than 1,100 community college presidents and their trustees, we write in support of H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act. The legislation achieves several important objectives for the nation's college students, who continue to face substantial financing challenges, even at low-cost community colleges. Its simplification of the current array of higher education tax benefits is critical given that their complexity has led to widespread under-utilization.

H.R. 3393 also includes a number of enhancements to the American Opportunity Tax Credit (AOTC) that benefit college students:

Makes AOTC Permanent: Currently set to expire at the end of 2017, the AOTC is the most important source of support for college students in the tax code. H.R. 3393 makes the benefit permanent and ensures that it will remain in place for students and families.

Increases Refundability: The AOTC's partial refundability is of great assistance to the many low-income students who attend community college. Currently, the maximum refundability under the AOTC is \$1,000. H.R. 3393 increases that amount by 50%, raising it to \$1,500, and provides students an easier path to claim that full refund.

Creates Better Alignment with the Pell Grant: Currently, an estimated one million college students with unmet financial need do not receive any benefit from the AOTC due to its poor coordination with the Pell Grant program. The vast majority of these students attend low-cost institutions, particularly community colleges. H.R. 3393 remedies this situation.

Indexes the AOTC to Inflation: H.R. 3393 recognizes that college prices are not static, and adjusts the AOTC for inflation (but not college tuition) starting in 2018.

We recognize that this legislation embodies certain trade-offs. Overall, however, it would better target benefits to community college students and other low-income students, and create a simplified system that greatly benefits all students and families. These are critically important objectives, and action on them is overdue. We thank you for your consideration of this legislation and urge its approval by the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

WALTER G. BUMPHUS,
AACC President and
CEO.

J. NOAH BROWN,
ACCT President and
CEO.

UNITED STATES
STUDENT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2014.

THE US STUDENT ASSOCIATION'S STATEMENT
ON THE STUDENT AND FAMILY TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT BILL

WASHINGTON, DC.—On behalf of the United States Student Association's (USSA) 1.5 million student members, we support the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act (H.R. 3393). The current crisis in higher education, and especially for low-income students, necessitates swift action for access and affordability.

This Act is a multi-pronged approach that would streamline existing tax credits—while making the American Opportunity Tax Credit permanent, increasing the maximum refundability, and enhancing coordination with the Pell Grant. Students are more likely to succeed if they do not have to navigate the complex landscape of higher education funding and support.

While we do believe that tax credits may not be the best solution in terms of expanding access and affordability for our low-income members—we much prefer funding and stronger support for the Pell Grant—we are nevertheless pleased that Congress is restarting an important conversation about simplification, thus benefitting all students and families.

Our vision is one in which students, no matter their race or socioeconomic status—have equal access and succeed in college—is paramount to the success of this nation. We look forward to working on these pressing issues with members of Congress.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I know we are hearing a lot from the other side about how this ought to be paid for, but they, frankly, exempted this from PAYGO. Well, what does that mean? They said this doesn't need to be paid for—this is such important policy—because if we can get people started on

the road to an education by getting a college degree, their chances of succeeding economically in life are so much better. And that really has become a basic for succeeding in America today is to get that bachelor's degree.

I know they are concerned about the graduate students, but, frankly, the Tax Code isn't there for those going to Harvard Law and Stanford Medical School. And there are other provisions that help provide for students: grants, loans, and scholarships.

This is about how can the Tax Code, how can all Americans help those get that basic level of education that gets you that bachelor's degree that gets you on the road of economic opportunity, because if we don't have an upwardly mobile society, we actually put at risk the American Dream.

With that, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) control the remainder of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to, first of all, thank my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee for all their help and their hard work on moving this bill forward. I would also like to thank Chairman CAMP for his leadership and for his dedication in helping American taxpayers and families, which is really what this bill is about.

Coming from two hardworking parents with no more than a ninth grade education between them, attending college was little more than just a dream for me growing up. Yet, with my parents' support and some hard work, I was able to be the first of my family to attend college and go on to graduate with a degree in nursing. This has allowed me to spend over 40 years working as a nurse in the health care industry.

Just as this dream was for me, pursuing higher education is a dream for millions of children and their parents across this great Nation. It is a well known fact that the cost of education is climbing and that, for far too many, the ability to save and pay for college without ending up under a mountain of debt is simply out of reach.

Today's broken Tax Code does little to ease that financial burden or to even provide a sense of security that education will be a reality in the future. That is why, under Chairman CAMP's leadership, I worked across the aisle with my colleague, DANNY DAVIS, as the chair and cochair of the Ways and Means Committee's Education Tax Reform Working Group last year.

Over the course of our 7-month bipartisan working group meetings, frustration with the Tax Code was a common theme of what we heard. For instance,

there are currently 15 different tax benefits related to education. Four of those are designed to help individuals save prior to becoming a student, nine are available for while the student is in school, and two exist for when the student has completed his or her education.

It was overwhelming when we had tax experts explain it, so it was not difficult to imagine how parents trying to navigate these 90 pages of IRS instructions would simply toss up their hands and say, "I give up."

That is why the work that Mr. DAVIS and I did during the time together on this Education Tax Reform Working Group didn't end when we delivered our report to our colleagues. Instead, our desire to provide at least some relief from that frustration led the two of us to work to see how we could clean up the Code and help families struggling to finance education costs.

That process led us to introduce H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act. Now, this legislation consolidates four existing education provisions—the Hope credit, the American opportunity tax credit, the lifetime learning credit, and the tuition deduction—into a single, modernized and strengthened AOTC.

Streamlining the number of education provisions and retooling those that are most effective allows us to simplify the Code and reduce some of the confusion that exists today. As a result, students can spend less time figuring out how to finance the cost of education and more time developing the skills they need to succeed in our knowledge-based economy.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all can agree that it ought to be easier for any family to plan, save, and invest in education. Everyone in this Chamber can agree that we should do everything that we can to help American children attain higher education and achieve their dream.

So I am proud that, as the chairman has already referenced, the American Association of Community Colleges, the Association of Community College Trustees, the National Association of College Stores, and the United States Student Association—the United States Student Association—have announced their support for this bill.

Now I ask for my colleagues in the House to join me in supporting this commonsense measure to help American students and families.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I include a letter from the American Council on Education with all of the signatories in the RECORD.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,

Washington, DC, July 17, 2014.

Re Student and Family Tax Simplification Act (H.R. 3393)

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the higher education associations listed below, I write to express concerns about H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification

Act, and encourage further improvements to this important legislation when it is considered on the House floor next week.

We have long supported reform of the American Opportunity Tax Credit (AOTC), the Hope Scholarship Credit, the Lifetime Learning Credit (LLC), and the tuition deduction. All of these currently are overly complex and difficult for students and their families to correctly use. We believe a consolidated credit can simplify the higher education tax benefits while retaining positive aspects of the present credits and deductions to better serve low- and middle-income traditional and nontraditional students now and in the future, helping them attain an associate or bachelor's degree or pursue post-baccalaureate education or lifelong learning.

Overall, H.R. 3393 takes several important steps forward to create a simpler, single tax credit. We applaud the fact that the bill increases refundability and includes an important fix to better coordinate the AOTC and the Pell Grant. We are also very pleased that the bill was amended at markup to maintain the AOTC's current income phase-out limits.

However, as we discussed in our attached letter of April 4, 2014 to Ways and Means Committee members, there are a number of other changes in the legislation which cause us great concern. Even as reported, the bill would negatively impact many low- and middle-income students and families who benefit under current law. It also would harm graduate students and lifetime learners who utilize the tuition deduction or the LLC. Because we continue to have serious concerns about the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act, we cannot support the bill as currently written, even in the form as reported.

As a result of our strong support for reforming these credits, we have had many discussions with tax staff over the past months about ways to implement reforms that address our concerns. We believe the legislation could be modified to ensure students who are currently eligible for a federal tax benefit could still receive some benefit. For example, one improvement we support is replacing the bill's proposed four-year limit for the AOTC with a lifetime dollar cap that would allow part-time, full-time, and graduate students to take advantage of the credit.

We remain deeply committed to continuing to work with the authors of the bill and the Ways and Means Committee to improve the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act to better serve traditional and non-traditional low- and middle-income students, now and in the future.

Sincerely,

MOLLY CORBETT BROAD,
President.

On behalf of:

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

American Council on Education

Association of American Universities

Association of Governing Boards

Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities

Association of Public and Land-grant Universities

College and University Professional Association for Human Resources

Council for Christian Colleges & Universities

Council of Graduate Schools

Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU).

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,

Washington, DC, April 4, 2014.

Re Higher Education Provisions in the Tax Reform Act of 2014 Discussion Draft

Hon. DAVE CAMP,

Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: On behalf of the American Council on Education and the undersigned higher education associations, we write regarding your recently released discussion draft of the Tax Reform Act of 2014. We commend you for your leadership on an issue as important as tax reform. Reforming the tax code is a critical element to addressing our nation's long-term fiscal health. There are a number of provisions in your discussion draft that would affect students and families, as well as the colleges and universities that serve them. We write now to comment on the education incentives addressed in your discussion draft. In the near future, we will offer additional comments on other provisions affecting higher education.

While the federal tax code is no substitute for the Pell Grant, Federal Work-Study, other federal student aid programs, and the financial aid colleges and universities provide, over the past two decades it has played an increasingly important role in helping low- and middle-income students and families finance higher education. The tax code contains a number of provisions, enacted discretely over time, that together create a framework that functions as a kind of "three-legged stool" intended to advance three important goals: 1) to encourage saving for higher education; 2) to help students and families pay for college; and 3) to assist with the repayment of student loans. This framework helps serve the needs of low- and middle-income students and families as they invest in themselves and their resources in higher education. Moreover, the broadening of access to higher education has larger benefits by helping to sustain a stable and productive society. We believe this framework should be strengthened and made more effective to aid more students and families.

We are very pleased to see that the discussion draft seeks to create a simpler, consolidated higher education tax credit. However, we believe that ultimately, the draft would make substantial changes to a number of higher education tax incentives that will undermine the "three-legged stool" framework and increase the burden on students and families in paying for college. While we support simplification, it can and should be done in a way that will not effectively increase the cost of a higher education for middle-income and nontraditional low-income students and families.

PROVISIONS TO HELP PAY FOR HIGHER
EDUCATION

The current tax code contains several provisions that help students and families pay for higher education: the American Opportunity Tax Credit (AOTC), the Lifelong Learning Credit (LLC), the above-the-line deduction for qualified tuition and related expenses (tuition deduction), Section 127 Employer-provided Educational Assistance, and Sec. 117(d) Qualified Tuition Reductions.

THE AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT, THE LIFETIME LEARNING CREDIT, AND THE TUITION DEDUCTION

We strongly support reform of current tax credits and the tuition deduction to provide students a single credit that provides assistance towards an associate or bachelor's degree, post-baccalaureate education and lifelong learning. Like you, we believe such a tax credit would serve students better than

the current overly complex credits and tuition deduction. Indeed, we endorsed the Universal Higher Education and Lifetime Learning Act of 2007 (H.R. 2458), bipartisan legislation which you introduced in the 110th Congress with then-Rep. Rahm Emanuel, which would have created a simpler, consolidated tax credit. Overall, the discussion draft takes several important steps forward to create a simpler, single tax credit. Unfortunately, some of the changes made by the draft would in fact be steps backward for many students and their families who benefit under current law.

Among the most positive steps forward, the bill maintains the expanded eligible expenses of the AOTC, which includes required course materials, as well as permanently extending and indexing a reconfigured AOTC. In a provision particularly important to the neediest students, the bill increases AOTC refundability to 60 percent from the current 40 percent, and permits eligible students to get the maximum value of \$1,500 in refundability more easily.

Equally important, the draft better coordinates the interaction of the AOTC with the Pell Grant, and, for the first time, completely excludes the Pell Grant from taxable income. Under current law, the AOTC contains a grant/scholarship offset that has the unintended effect of sharply limiting the size of the tax credit for needy students. As a result, some of the lowest-income students receiving the maximum Pell Grant award (\$5,645 for the current academic year) receive no benefit from the AOTC, regardless of the level of refundability. We applaud you for addressing this problem, which is crucial to helping these needy students.

Unfortunately, the draft would make other changes that would eliminate benefits for many students and thereby adversely impact their financial ability to pursue an associate or bachelor's degree, graduate education, or lifelong learning. In short, we believe that the single, consolidated tax credit created by the draft will harm traditional middle-income undergraduates, adult learners (particularly those with lower incomes), and low- and middle-income graduate students. Because of the draft's reconfigured AOTC, which significantly lowers current income eligibility phase-outs, eliminates the Lifetime Learning Credit, and the tuition deduction, these students would not receive tax benefits they currently rely upon to help finance their higher education.

First, the draft appears to rely on outdated assumptions about the typical student in higher education. Today, nearly 50 percent of undergraduates and three-quarters of all students are adult learners, age 23 or older, with a quarter over age 30, a proportion that will likely continue to grow. These students are not just older than their traditional classmates. They tend to work full-time or have dependents—including multiple roles as parents and caregivers—serve in the military, or some combination of these, and take a longer time to complete their degree. Moreover, 50 percent of all students attend part-time, which inevitably increases time to completion. While the median time to degree for all bachelor's degree recipients is 4.3 years, for adult students (between ages 24–29), the median time to degree is 6.6 years. Consequently, the bill's four-year limit on benefits, in combination with the elimination of the LLC and tuition deduction for which part-time students are eligible, will cost many undergraduates financial assistance.

A reformed, consolidated credit should preserve current benefits for as many students as possible and take into account the demographic profile of today's students described above. The number of these nontraditional

students will increase in the future, and any legislation that creates a permanent, consolidated credit should address their needs. A lifetime dollar usage cap on the benefit rather than a four-year limitation is a potential solution.

Second, with its adoption of the Hope Tax Credit income phase-out limits, the draft reduces the income phase-outs to amounts originally enacted in 1997 for the Hope Tax Credit, which are well below those in the current AOTC. This change would make many middle-income students and their families ineligible for benefits. Many of these families are increasingly caught between stagnant wage growth and their ineligibility for most other forms of federal financial aid. Moreover, these reduced income phase-out limits do not take into account the realities of the cost of living in different regions of the country. For example, no one would consider as wealthy a two-wage earning couple, such as a retail manager and a teacher, living in a high-cost area with one or more children and a combined family income of \$135,000. This is equally true of the single parent earning \$72,000 with a college-bound child or two. Yet, both families would be ineligible under the reconfigured AOTC in this bill.

Third, the reconfigured AOTC proposed in this draft would provide no benefit to lifelong learners and graduate students, many of whom are low-income and need assistance in pursuing additional skill development or the advanced degrees that employers and our economy require. We need to preserve tax benefits that enhance access for such students.

According to the Tax Policy Center, recent data demonstrate that the LLC is serving students with low and moderate incomes. In 2013, approximately 1.95 million students with an income at or below \$75,000 utilized the LLC, including 1 million with an income of \$40,000 or less.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, in 2011–12, a quarter of all graduate students earned less than \$11,000, and half were below \$32,000. During that same year, there were 1.3 million master's degree students—nearly three-quarters of all graduate students—and approximately 31 percent received no financial aid. Forty-six percent of all master's students and 25 percent of all doctoral students borrowed for their degree. The median amount of those loans per year was \$15,665 for master's students and \$17,629 for doctoral students. The percentage of African American and Hispanic master's and doctoral students with loans was higher than the national average, and their median loan balances were higher as well. A significant number of master's students pursue degrees in fields that are not highly compensated, like teaching, social work, counseling, or public health. The loss of benefits for graduate students under this draft comes on top of recent decisions by policy makers to end graduate-student eligibility for federal subsidized loans and force them to pay higher interest rates on student loans than undergraduates, a troubling pattern of increasing the cost of education for students pursuing advanced degrees.

In short, we are concerned that the bill takes away benefits from one set of students—both low- and middle-income, as well as graduate students—to pay for aid to a narrower set of low-income students. While the goal to enhance assistance to the neediest students is laudable and certainly a goal we share, we do not believe it should be at the expense of other students and families who may be struggling to invest in a higher education.

Given your long-standing interest in improving these overly complex education in-

centives as well as the bipartisan support for action on this issue, we believe the time may be right to make important reforms to these provisions. Unfortunately, we cannot support the approach taken in the discussion draft. Instead, we urge you to consider other legislative models for reform, such as your previous legislation and the American Opportunity Tax Credit Act of 2013 (H.R. 1738), which would also consolidate the AOTC and Lifetime Learning Credit into one simplified, permanent AOTC but in ways that address the concerns outlined above.

SECTION 127 EMPLOYER-PROVIDED EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Section 127 allows employers to offer employees up to \$5,250 annually in tuition assistance, which is excluded from taxable income. It is effectively a matching grant program in which the federal government forgoes a proportionally small amount of revenue to leverage the investment employers make in their employees and the American workforce. According to the most recent available Department of Education data, the more than 1.1 million American workers who used this tuition assistance in the 2011–12 academic year had average annual earnings of \$53,880. This provision has been an important means of building and adding to the competencies of the workforce and is a critical tool to help our nation accelerate its economic growth. The top majors among recipients of this benefit include those in the STEM fields. More than 35 percent of degrees pursued by employees using education assistance are master's degrees.

Section 127 was made permanent in the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012. Instead of repealing Section 127, we firmly believe this overwhelmingly successful element of the tax code should be enhanced to allow employers to offer higher levels of tax-favored tuition assistance to their employees. We recommend that the \$5,250 annual limit, which has not changed since the 1970s, be increased with an automatic adjustment for inflation. This would be an extremely effective reform that would generate more private sector funds for financial aid to low- and middle-income students.

SECTION 117(D) QUALIFIED TUITION REDUCTIONS

Section 117(d) permits educational institutions, including colleges and universities, to provide their employees, spouses, or dependents with tuition reductions that are excluded from taxable income. This long-standing provision helps employees and members of their families afford a college education, providing an important benefit to many middle- and low-income college employees. A broad cross-section of our employees benefit from Section 117(d). Indeed, under the law, if an institution chooses to offer this benefit, then all employees must be able to receive it. As such, the benefit has been used by a range of employees, including secretaries and other front-line administrative staff and maintenance and janitorial staff, as well as faculty. In addition to the help it provides our employees, Section 117(d) also gives colleges and universities an important tool for recruiting and retaining valued employees, helping maintain the quality of education our schools can offer. It has been particularly important for many small, private, denominational schools to compete for top employees. Eliminating this benefit would particularly harm employees who are poised to send their children to college and have premised their career choices and college savings decisions on the existing tuition benefits for their children, hurting the lowest-paid college employees the most. For these reasons, Section 117(d) should be preserved.

PROVISIONS TO ASSIST IN REPAYMENT OF
STUDENT LOANS:

The current tax code contains provisions that affect the ability of students to repay their student loan debt. As students increasingly have come to rely on loans to finance their college education, we strongly believe the tax code should continue to assist borrowers as they repay their loans.

REPEAL OF STUDENT LOAN INTEREST
DEDUCTION (SLID):

The draft would repeal the above-the-line deduction for student loan interest. SLID currently permits taxpayers with less than \$75,000 of income (\$155,000 for joint filers) to deduct up to \$2,500 in federal student loan interest payments each year. To qualify, a student loan must have been for qualified educational expenses, such as tuition and fees, course materials, and room and board.

Over the course of an undergraduate education, many students take out at least one federal student loan. According to the College Board, 34 percent of undergraduates used federal loans to finance their education in the 2012–13 academic year. Managing student loan debt after graduation can be a significant hardship. Recent federal actions have increased borrowing costs by eliminating the six-month interest grace period college graduates previously received and by implementing interest charges for graduate student borrowers while they are in school. With these increased loan costs, SLID has become even more important. The current \$2,500 interest limit has been in place since 1997. SLID should not be eliminated.

EXCLUSION OF DISCHARGE OF STUDENT LOAN
DEBT:

The discussion draft would repeal the tax exclusion for student loan debt forgiven for individuals that worked for a specified time period in certain professions or for a class of employers. This tax exclusion applies to several federal and state loan forgiveness programs, including the Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) for borrowers working in government and certain nonprofit jobs, TEACH to assist future teachers, and the National Health Services Corps Loan Repayment Program, which assists medical health professionals working in underserved areas of the country. Each of these programs permits former students with high student loan debt to more easily manage their debt and avoid default in exchange for working, likely for lower salaries, in ways that help serve our society.

Congress created various student loan forgiveness programs, including some of the programs mentioned above, in an effort to increase college access and affordability by lowering the burden of student loan debt. We have long supported these efforts and the tax exclusion of the discharge of remaining student loan debt as part of these programs because we believe in the policy goal and the attendant benefits it provides to the larger society. Indeed, we have long advocated that this tax exclusion be extended to two other federal loan forgiveness programs, the Income-Based Repayment (IBR) and Income Contingent Repayment (ICR), to which it does not currently apply. Repeal of the current tax exclusion of discharge of student loan debt would undermine the purpose of these important loan forgiveness programs. In addition, for those programs that require regular loan repayment over many years, taxing the discharge of remaining student loan debt would amount to punishment of these responsible borrowers.

Currently, there are approximately 20 million students enrolled in college in the United States, with approximately 12 million (60 percent) taking out student loans to pay

for college. Student loan debt is now in excess of \$1 trillion, exceeding debt in consumer credit cards. At a time when more students are borrowing more money for college, it would be a terrible and shortsighted policy decision to repeal the current tax exclusion for discharge of student loan debt. Instead, this exclusion should be preserved and expanded to cover amounts forgiven under the IBR and ICR programs

CONCLUSION:

As we know you agree, our nation's long-term economic growth depends upon a larger, well-educated and trained workforce. Despite their well-documented flaws, the current AOTC, LLC, and the tuition deduction work in tandem with other forms of federal student financial support, including Sections 127 and 117(d) and other tax provisions, to enhance access to education, advance attainment and workforce development goals, and help sustain a vibrant society. We are confident that a consolidated credit can simplify the higher education tax benefits while still retaining aspects of the present credits and deductions that serve an increasingly diverse student population. In addition, we strongly believe that comprehensive tax reform provides a critical opportunity to enhance the "three-legged stool" framework of federal education tax incentives.

We stand ready to work with you to improve your discussion draft in ways that will advance the broader goal of reforming the education tax incentives to better serve traditional and non-traditional low- and middle-income students now and in the future.

Sincerely,

MOLLY CORBETT BROAD,
President.

On behalf of:
American Association of State Colleges and Universities
American Council on Education
Association of American Universities
Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities
Association of Public and Land-grant Universities
College and University Professional Association for Human Resources
Council for Christian Colleges and Universities
Council of Graduate Schools
Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities
National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Today's bill is another element of a Republican agenda that has consistently weakened our Federal commitment to educational opportunity.

I agree with the American Council on Education which said:

"The Federal Tax Code is no substitute for the Pell grant, Federal Work-Study, and other Federal student aid programs."

Republicans have voted again and again in this Congress to cut these investments in our future. House Republicans approved a budget that would eliminate \$90 billion of Pell grants, would deny 125,000 students Federal Work-Study assistance, and would have reduced funding for Hispanic-serving universities and Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Now the Republicans come to the floor and are really boasting of the fact that this particular version of the bill does not cut Federal tax incentives for education as much as they wanted to.

□ 1615

As originally introduced by my colleague from Tennessee, this bill would have denied 5 million Americans every year an opportunity to use education tax incentives that exist under current law. They would have slashed assistance under the act by \$5 billion a year, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation. And so they went back and tinkered with it a little bit, and they are here today to brag that they have a D-minus bill and that is better than the failing bill that they offered initially.

I understand that after years of opposing this particular incentive, they might want to change course. They all voted against the improvements, the changes that I authored in 2009 for the American Opportunity Tax Credit. They have consistently opposed the concept of refundability, that is, assisting those students who might not have a tax liability as big as the amount of the credit. And it is progress that they have come around to supporting the credit at all and the concept of helping those at the bottom of the ladder.

But while they have reduced the depths of the serious cuts that they proposed only a few months ago to these tax incentives, they have not stopped the bleeding. They deny assistance to many students across America who are assisted by our current law. That is why, as my colleague Mr. LEVIN pointed out, a group of educational institutions, whether it is Hispanic colleges or Christian colleges or land grant colleges, they all oppose this bill. They have said, and again I quote:

"The bill would negatively impact many low- and middle-income students and families who benefit under current law."

That is what the educational experts say. And that is because the bill eliminates a guarantee under existing law called the Lifetime Learning Credit. It is eliminated entirely for so many students, and it is important to understand who those students are because I have seen and talked with them at places like San Antonio College, ACC, and St. Philip's College.

What kind of person are we talking about? Someone who is a single mother, who has a child to take care of, and continues to work trying to get her associate's degree first, to move out of a low-wage job into a better job, and then go on to UT or somewhere else, but she can't get it all done in 4 years; a mid-level worker who wants to shift industries and needs to upgrade his or her skills for a job in the new economy. They have to work and go to school at night. They can't get it all done in 4 years. A recent college graduate who says, you know, in order to get the job I am best qualified for, I am going to

have to have a master's degree. But they are denied assistance and the opportunity to climb up the economic ladder of success, not by the existing law, but by the changes that the Republicans proposed today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. DOGGETT. All these students lose out. The impact is serious. According to the Department of Education, about half of all students pursuing a higher education attend part time, which inevitably extends the time it takes for them to complete the degree.

Eliminating a tax incentive for higher education that takes more than 4 years away will deal a blow to nearly 2 million students across America who claimed the Lifetime Learning Credit, or they did in 2013. Of these, about a million earn less than \$40,000 a year. That is who is being cut by this.

I have legislation that over 100 of our colleagues have joined to do all the streamlining they talk about, but to make the American Opportunity Tax Credit permanent and to ensure that we don't cut out benefits to students who are counting on these benefits. We need to reject this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 10 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. We need to reject this bill that still comes up too short for too many students. We need to let them succeed in today's global economy and ensure that students have the support that America needs to be competitive and successful.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do want to say that this was an incredible experience for me to be able to work with such a fine gentleman as Mr. DAVIS.

We began this process with the chairman giving us an opportunity to take a look at this very complicated group of tax provisions in our code. What we found, with the Joint Committee on Taxation helping us, as I referenced in my opening remarks, there are 90 different pages, no less the fact that there are provisions that step on top of one another, and we actually asked the Joint Committee on Taxation, to help simplify this, to do a diagram for us, just a flowchart.

What we found was, they came back and said this is so complicated that we can't even do a flowchart that would make sense. So we set out asking various groups to come and talk to us. These went all of the way from the very conservative, the very progressive side, think tanks, universities, colleges, those who represented the 529 provision, and to just come and let us know about what they thought about what was currently in the code.

We heard consistently over and over again, it didn't matter where they were

on the spectrum, we heard this is so complicated that people are not even using it because they can't figure out. As a matter of fact, there is a GAO study that indicated that 1.5 million tax filers who qualify for either the tuition and fee deduction of the lifetime learning credit in 2009 did not even claim the credit or the deduction because of its complication.

So it was my honor to work with my esteemed colleague in going to work to say: What can we do to simplify this so that we can make sure that people who really need this assistance are going to get that assistance that is there in the code but they can't even figure it out?

So after about 7 months, hammering back and forth about what we felt would best fit the needs of the students of this country and help to get them a start in college, to get them going, to be sure that they would have that opportunity to use those tax credits, we came up with this product. We then rolled it out with a press conference, and I am very proud to say that this was an effort of bipartisanship, one that I think if we could do more of that here in Congress, we would be accomplishing a lot. So it really is my honor to stand here today with my colleague who we worked so well together on this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my real pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), a distinguished—to put it lightly—member of our committee.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. It is amazing how any bill that reaches the House, all you have to do is put a title on it and then not read it, and you think you have got something going. Listen to the way this bill, H.R. 3393, is described. It sounds like the committee that put it together was well on the way to reform, that they have taken a whole lot of complex provisions and combined them into one to make it easier for the applicant to understand what is going on. The problem with that is when you do all of that and make it simple, and then put a trillion-dollar bill on top of it and make it permanent and cut off benefits for other people, it just shows that when people use the word "reform," it doesn't necessarily mean that you are doing better.

I admired the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee when he put together a tax bill and had the courage to eliminate a lot of the tax credits that were not paid for, a lot of loopholes that were in the law, and I think it was supposed to be revenue neutral, as difficult as that sounded. But no one ever thought, certainly not PAUL RYAN, when he said:

The people deserve a government that works for them, not one that buries them in more debt.

Well, this is exactly what this bill does. It is permanent. There are no pro-

visions to pay for it, and it buries us in more debt.

But what really annoyed me the most was this 4-year limit because, if I can just beg the House for its indulgence, when I came out of the Army, I thought I was the cat's meow in terms of how much people appreciated my contribution to the security of this country. And of course I went to the Veterans Administration to see what my benefits as related to education would be. They told me the first thing I had to do was to take an aptitude test and that Catholic Charities would provide the test. So I picked up my rosary and I went to Catholic Charities, and they asked me a lot of questions.

When they completed it, they concluded that I should be studying to become a mortician or an electrician. I didn't emphasize that I was Catholic because I didn't think it would make that much difference. But when I refused to agree with that conclusion and asked them to show me one question that I answered that would allow them to believe that I should be a mortician or an electrician, they said: My son, it is not so much that, it is just that you have a 4-year cap on the education.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. RANGEL. They said you have a 4-year cap on the education. I was shocked to be reminded that I hadn't completed high school. I had to complete 2 years of high school and 4 years of college. Instead of telling me that, I found out the hard way that I had a 4-year ceiling. Well, I was able to convince them after a year to reduce my 2 years by combining it with credits for 1 year and the college for 4 years to 3 years, so I got under the hammer.

But I cannot imagine, when technology means so much for a person to hold onto their job, just to keep up with the technology that is there, when they can almost feel the elevation of the qualifications that are necessary, that the United States Government would say: Well, you almost made it because we have just put a 4-year cap on your ability to really be productive in this country.

But I guess what hurts me the most is the hypocrisy that is involved here when we talk about the national debt. Is that something we just have to talk about? Should we talk about the interest that we pay on the national debt, or should we really just talk about getting a Tax Code that is simplified, that does encourage economic growth, and that does make it possible for people to believe there is equity in this.

Now, I know the chairman had a beautiful draft and it was lauded by Republicans and Democrats, but this is the end of the session and we find ourselves with the tax bills accumulating a trillion dollars worth of debt, so why talk about giving someone an education when the debt of the Nation may bury them, as the chairman of the Budget Committee has said.

So I am convinced that the image hasn't changed, but the method in presenting a cutoff of benefits has changed in how it is presented.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the esteemed chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, when I hear my friends from the other side talk about their concern for the growing national debt, I know we must have a good bill because they don't want to talk about the bill. The deficit went up every year the Democrats were in the majority, and it has gone down every year the Republicans have been in the majority, but let me talk a little bit about this piece of legislation.

When it was created, it was not paid for. It was created for 2 years. When it was renewed in 2010 for 2 years, it was not paid for. When it was renewed in 2012 for 5 years, it was not paid for.

What we have in this country is repeatedly renewing tax policy for short term, not paying for it, not making it reliable. We are the only nation in the world that does this. What we are looking for is not only making this policy simpler and easier to understand, as the sponsor of the bill has explained very well, but we also want to make this permanent so we don't have to come back and wonder, so families that are planning for three or four of their kids to go to college over the next 10 years don't have to wonder, Are these provisions going to be there? Am I going to finally figure out these 100 pages of instructions and start to plan for my children's college education only to find, oh, Congress didn't get around to extending this provision this time?

□ 1630

So part of this is about permanency. How do we make these policies last? Also, how do we make sure that people at the lower end of the economic ladder have a chance to save for college, have a chance to get in college, even though they may not have income to qualify for some of the tax credits?

This reform does that. I think this is an important step forward. It has been extended basically for a budget window without being paid for by both parties, so let's call it what it is, it is permanent policy.

Let's make it permanent policy so families and students can rely on a constant policy, so that they can plan and save for a college education, which is becoming more and more a basic standard that people need to succeed in life.

I think if we can do anything this year, it is about making a statement that we want to help families and students succeed not only in school, but also going forward in their careers and lives.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), another member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect and admiration for the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, my friend from Michigan. I hope his solution here today, given the dysfunction that we have seen in the process coming out of this Congress in recent years, is not just to come forward with a series of permanent changes to the U.S. Tax Code without paying for any of it and exploding our national debt for future generations to have to grapple with, but unfortunately, that has been the trend in the Ways and Means Committee over the last couple of months.

I also want to commend the work that the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) has done with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) in putting together this bipartisan bill.

I am all for simplification of the Tax Code. I am all for streamlining these tax credits to make it easier for students and their families to better afford higher education. I am all for finding a bipartisan path forward to make sure that no student is left behind, that those doors of educational opportunity are there and open for all Americans, but we ought to do that the right way, not the wrong way.

Unfortunately, the bill here before us today is the wrong way to approach the issue. First of all, it is one of 14 permanent changes to the Tax Code that have been reported out of the Ways and Means Committee now, exceeding over \$800 billion, without any of it being offset and without a nickel of it being paid for—this on the heels of the last few years we have been trying to figure out a way to get our fiscal house put back in order.

There has been a whole lot of shrill and a whole lot of crying on this floor about runaway budget deficits and the unsustainable debt that our Nation has accumulated and the fact that we have to borrow so much money from China. This bill compounds that problem. It doesn't solve it.

This bill alone would add close to \$97 billion to the national debt over the next 10 years. Again, none of it paid for, but there are also some substantive problems with this bill, too, that, unfortunately, due to a lack of hearings in the Ways and Means Committee, due to a lack of discussion and feedback from our universities throughout the country, is not addressed, not the least of which—and I have heard this from universities back in Wisconsin—that there is a significant administrative change hiding in this bill.

Currently, schools can report either eligible tuition charges that are billed to students or paid to students. This bill takes away the billing aspect of reporting to the IRS.

Now, that is probably a trend that we ought to pursue and should fix in the future, but to do it abruptly, given

where the computer systems lie with their universities right now, is bound to cause severe disruption in regards to these tax credits for students.

I am afraid that it has not been well-vetted, and it hasn't been thought through because, again, it is an election year, and we are racing these bills to the floor in order to do our press releases back home and score cheap political points with constituencies that would prefer to see legislation advance without paying for it; but it is something that we ought to fix before we burden the bursars' offices throughout the Nation and trying to revamp their computer systems overnight. They are telling us it is not going to work.

Furthermore, the gentleman from Michigan has highlighted the impact this is going to have on our graduate students. The graduate students are affected by the streamlining of the education credits that are embodied in this bill because only 4 years are available under this legislation. It is expected to have a profound impact on the affordability of graduate education for students throughout the Nation. I don't think that has been vetted all that well either.

It is because we are not doing regular order around here. It is an election year—I get it—and there is nothing easier in the world to bring permanent changes to the Tax Code that everyone would desire to see, but without making the tough decision and paying for it as well, while at the same time coming forward with budget resolutions that is cutting back on the availability of Pell grants for low-income students or workstudy programs for low-income students or TRIO or GEAR UP programs that are geared for low-income students.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KIND. Somehow, some way, it became fashionable to cut those programs that have benefited low-income students, including myself. When I was a kid growing up, my family didn't have the financial means to send me to school, so I was able to qualify for a Pell grant, I did do workstudy all 4 years. Without that availability, I don't know where I would have ended up with my education.

That is where we seem to go to first in the budget for cuts and then coming forward today on a bill that will add \$97 billion to the deficit without paying for it and without vetting it the way it should be. We have still got time. Let's do this right now.

I would encourage my colleagues to vote "no" and give this body time to fix some of the deficiencies in the bill, but also to make the tough decision and do it in a fiscally responsible manner.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What I would like to do is read from a letter that we received in support of

this legislation from the American Association of Community Colleges and the Association of Community College Trustees.

I am just going to lift a couple of paragraphs out of here that I think address some of the responses from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I am only going to read three pieces, although there are more.

This is why they say that they believe this benefits college students. I want to read the one that says it “makes AOTC Permanent: Currently set to expire at the end of 2017, the AOTC is the most important source of support for college students in the Tax Code. H.R. 3393 makes the benefit permanent and ensures that it will remain in place for students and families.”

The chairman referenced that just a few moments ago.

Another paragraph: “Creates better alignment with the Pell grant: Currently, an estimated 1 million college students with unmet financial need do not receive any benefit from the AOTC due to its poor coordination with the Pell grant program. The vast majority of these students attend low-cost institutions, particularly community colleges.”

This bill remedies this situation.

Then the last piece: “Indexes the AOTC to inflation: H.R. 3393 recognizes that college prices are not static and adjusts the AOTC for inflation starting in 2018.”

So I believe that that speaks to those pieces that we said are so important in this reform.

Now, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS), the leader of our conference.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader on this legislation—great work—and the chairman.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act. I was the first in my family to graduate from college, and I understand firsthand the struggle that families face to pay for higher education. As a matter of fact, I am still paying off some student loans from graduate school.

For today's graduates, the picture is even much bleaker. In fact, seven out of 10 graduates are entering the workforce with \$33,000 in student loan debt, up \$2,000 just from last year. For many, student and parent loans are often the only option to address the higher cost of college.

Our outdated Tax Code is no help. With 15 different complicated overlapping provisions, we need a Tax Code that works for people. That is what H.R. 3393 does. It simplifies the Tax Code, so that families and students can actually use and benefit from it as they pursue higher education.

The latest unemployment rate for recent college graduates is 8½ percent. More than 16 percent of them are underemployed. We need every tool at our

disposal to put money back in the pockets of families, so that they are empowered to make better choices.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3393.

Mr. LEVIN. Could I ask how much time there is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 7¼ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Does the gentlewoman have other speakers?

Mrs. BLACK. I am ready to close.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentlewoman has just talked about her work in graduate school. This bill would eliminate help for millions of people in graduate school. That is what this bill does.

I now yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding.

Tax-based aid represents more than half of all nonloan Federal support for higher education, giving tax policy a critical role in promoting college affordability, access, and completion.

Although I strongly support improving the education credits for students and families, I cannot support the Republican piecemeal tax approach that would add \$825 billion to the deficit and imperil our economic recovery and the well-being of our citizens.

As partners in the Education and Family Benefits Tax Working Group, I was delighted to work with Representative BLACK and her staff from Tennessee. I want to thank her and her staff for a wonderful legislative experience. It was, indeed, a delight.

I also want to commend Chairman CAMP for taking the bold initiative to put comprehensive tax reform in the discussion and on the table.

Our bill represents a bipartisan compromise that integrates promising reforms to tax-based education benefits suggested to us by both conservative and progressive stakeholders.

This bill simplifies our Tax Code and strengthens our investment in students and their families, expanding aid to the lowest-income students by modestly expanding the refundability of the credit, removing obstacles to claiming the credit, improving the coordination of tax and Pell policies, and indexing the credit to inflation.

However, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act was intended as part of comprehensive tax reform. Within a comprehensive package, policymakers are better able to pay for our tax cuts and ensure that groups of taxpayers who may lose out in one section are helped in others.

I look forward to continuing to work in a bipartisan way to improve education tax policy, but I oppose moving this bill in isolation of other education tax reforms and at the exclusion of other critical tax provisions that help

the working poor, strengthen economically distressed communities, promote affordable housing, help cover public transportation costs, incentivize businesses to hire hard-to-employ workers, and assist teachers with classroom expenses.

I don't think anything is much more important than education affordability, but I believe that first things come first. For me right now, before I would suggest spending any more money, I would suggest that we find a way to put an unemployment check in the hands of the 3 million people who are waiting in America, so they can live until they can get to college.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In conclusion, we favor on this side of the aisle simplification. We are in favor of reducing the number of pages. We are not in favor of leaving out millions of students.

□ 1645

This approach hasn't been refuted. It leaves out millions of undergraduates, millions of graduate students, and millions of people who are in longer-term education needs who can't complete college in 4 years, and, in many cases, want to go on to graduate school.

So what has happened here is another bill has come out of committee that is part of a package that was over \$800 billion. It leaves out so many, yet you make it permanent. These are people permanently left out. Why?

Many of these bills go back some years. We will have to check back many years ago and see if perhaps they were paid for. The recent one was in the Recovery Act of 2009, which we favored, but we did not favor making permanent laws that would leave out. That is what is being done here.

I have heard: Oh, we will come back some other time. You are going to come back some other time when you have added a trillion dollars to the deficit? That is not believable.

Indeed, what is believable is the result of this kind of reckless course is it is going to squeeze further discretionary, nondefense expenditures. That squeezing out is, as I said earlier, is the hard-hearted approach of the Ryan budget.

We see what happens when Republicans essentially use the argument that we can't pay for it, when they cut all the kinds of programs that I mentioned at the beginning, so many were cut out in the Ryan Republican budget.

I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I could say a lot of things, but I don't think there is any better way for me to conclude than for me to read a letter that I will submit for the RECORD from a student who actually sent this to me today.

I do want to read it, but I think you will see after I read it that the emphasis here is that we are helping those

who need help the most by what we are doing with the simplification of this particular part of the Code.

For the sake of the identity of the person, I am going to use the name Nancy.

Let me read this to you:

Dear Congresswoman Black, my name is Nancy, and I attend Atlanta Technical College. The additional \$500 in refunds in your bill for students like me will be extremely beneficial.

I am the mother of five, full-time worker, and student. Although I intend to continue my higher education once I graduate from the Atlanta Technical College, I have found out my Pell grant will expire next semester. I now find myself in the position of taking out loans for future semesters to make sure my tuition and books are paid for.

I plan to use my taxes to help with this dilemma. The additional \$500 may not seem like it would cover a lot, but in my case, it will cover at least one three-credit class or at least three of my textbooks. I would love the opportunity to have an option of using these moneys that are outright mine than to put myself in debt more by taking out a full amount of any loan.

My only hope is that you take this letter into consideration, for there are many others out there in my predicament.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN BLACK, My name is Nancy and I attend Atlanta Technical College. The additional \$500 in refunds in your bill for students like me would be extremely beneficial.

I am a mother of 5, full time worker and student. Although I intend to continue my higher education once I graduate from Atlanta Technical College, I have found out my Pell grant will expire next semester. I now find myself in the position of taking out loans for future semesters to make sure my tuition and books are paid for.

I plan to use my taxes to help with this dilemma. The additional \$500 may not seem like it would cover a lot, but in my case, it will cover at least one 3 credit class or at least 3 of my textbooks. I would love the opportunity to have an option of using monies that are outright mine, than to put myself in debt more by taking out the full amount of any loan.

My only hope is that you take this letter into consideration, for there are many others out here in my predicament.

Mrs. BLACK. I think there is no better way than to end with something that comes from the heart of a student who is working so hard. She has five children and is a full-time worker and student. Because of the refundability of this tax provision, if it were placed into law, you can see how it would really help those who we are trying to help the very most.

So I would urge my colleagues, for the sake of helping our students, especially those who are at the lower and middle income, to support H.R. 3393, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 680, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Sinema moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3393 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 4. INFORMING STUDENTS OF SAVINGS THROUGH LOWER INTEREST RATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall, in publications relating to the credit allowed under section 25A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, include a table that illustrates the difference between monthly payment amounts (with respect to various principal amounts and, at a minimum, under a standard repayment plan) for specified higher education loans—

(1) under the applicable rate of interest on such loans as determined under section 455(b)(8) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and

(2) under a rate of interest on such loans that is 2 percent lower than such applicable rate of interest.

(b) SPECIFIED HIGHER EDUCATION LOAN.—For purposes of this section, the term “specified higher education loan” means any loan which is made under part B, D, or C of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If this amendment is adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

This motion is straightforward and common sense. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to provide students with the information they need to compare the costs of student loans.

In providing information on tax credits, the Treasury Secretary must publish a table showing the amount of savings that a student would achieve on a monthly basis under different student loan rates. Students should be provided this important information before they take on debt.

Mr. Speaker, our country has a student debt crisis. As an adjunct professor at Arizona State University, I frequently hear from my students about how difficult it is to effectively manage their student loans.

Angela Schultz, Brian Garcia, Iliamari Vazquez, Brandie Reiner, Jack Welty, Andy Albright, Diego Soto, Anthony Carly, Ellen Hamilton, Ariel Carlos, Kent Fogg, Joe Slaven, Brandy Pantilione, Gary Brewer, and Christopher Valles are only a few of the young college graduates from Arizona

State University, my alma mater, who shared their stories with me.

Some of these young people are my students at Arizona State University. Some are recent graduates. Some of them are thinking of starting a family, while others are working hard to care for the families they already have.

What do these graduates want? They just want a fair shot. They want to know that their hard work in college mattered, that it led to the promise that their parents made to them when they were little—the promise we all believe in: if you work hard and play by the rules, you can succeed.

Essentially, they want what each one of us has wanted for ourselves, what we want for our own kids, and what we are working for in our districts. They want a shot at the American Dream.

Angela graduated from Arizona State University in 2012. She now faces the biggest financial hurdle of her life. She doesn't face massive medical bills or an expensive car loan. It is not rent or mortgage payments. It is a bill for over \$85,000 in student loans. Iliamari will graduate in 2015. When she does, she will have over \$64,000 in student loans.

Nationally, outstanding student loans now total more than \$1.2 trillion, surpassing total credit card debt, and every year, students are taking on more. An estimated 71 percent of college seniors had debt in 2012, with an average outstanding balance of \$29,400 for those who borrowed to get a bachelor's degree.

Young people are foregoing long-term job opportunities and home ownership in order to meet the urgent demands of their large student loan payments.

I relied on Pell grants, academic scholarships, and Federal loans all through school, just like my Arizona State students do today. I know students need guidance and assistance to manage their student debt.

I talk to young people who are excited to share their ideas and thoughts with me about how to solve some of the world's biggest problems. However, it concerns me that these same young people are daunted by the prospect of an expensive education that they want, but fear they cannot afford.

Rising college costs are putting higher education and the American Dream out of reach for too many hardworking Arizona families. Education is key to economic growth and job creation and, for many, it is a clear pathway out of poverty. I know this because education was the key to my own path out of poverty and to the middle class.

We must take action to combat this crisis. We need to give students the information they need to make smart decisions about paying for education. That is why I offered this motion to recommit today. It is why I am asking my colleagues to support this reasonable motion, and I call on Congress to do more to make the American Dream accessible and affordable for more American families.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit has absolutely nothing to do with helping give middle class families the resources need to send their kids to college. This has nothing to do with making tax policy more certain, easier to understand, or simplifying a very complex area of the Tax Code. This has nothing to do with helping families who are struggling to pay for education.

Let's get on with trying to do that job. Let's reject this motion to recommit, let's pass the underlying bill, and let's help middle class America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and the motion to instruct on H.R. 3230.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 195, nays 219, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 448]

YEAS—195

Barber	Cummings	Horsford
Barrow (GA)	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Beatty	Davis, Danny	Huffman
Becerra	DeFazio	Israel
Bera (CA)	DeGette	Jeffries
Bishop (GA)	Delaney	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY)	DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.
Blumenauer	DelBene	Jones
Bonamici	Deutch	Kaptur
Brady (PA)	Dingell	Keating
Braley (IA)	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Broun (GA)	Doyle	Kennedy
Brown (FL)	Duckworth	Kildee
Brownley (CA)	Edwards	Kilmer
Bustos	Ellison	Kind
Butterfield	Engel	Kirkpatrick
Capps	Enyart	Kuster
Capuano	Eshoo	Langevin
Cárdenas	Esty	Larsen (WA)
Carney	Farr	Larson (CT)
Carson (IN)	Fattah	Lee (CA)
Cartwright	Foster	Levin
Castor (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Lipinski
Castro (TX)	Fudge	Loebsack
Chu	Gabbard	Lofgren
Ciilline	Gallego	Lowenthal
Clark (MA)	Garamendi	Lowey
Clarke (NY)	Garcia	Lujan Grisham
Clay	Grayson	(NM)
Cleaver	Green, Al	Luján, Ben Ray
Clyburn	Green, Gene	(NM)
Cohen	Grijalva	Lynch
Connolly	Gutiérrez	Maffei
Conyers	Hahn	Maloney
Cooper	Hastings (FL)	Carolyn
Costa	Higgins	Maloney, Sean
Courtney	Himes	Matheson
Crowley	Hinojosa	Matsui
Cuellar	Holt	McCarthy (NY)

McCollum	Pingree (ME)	Sinema
McDermott	Pocan	Sires
McGovern	Polis	Slaughter
McIntyre	Price (NC)	Smith (WA)
McNerney	Ruiz	Speier
Meeks	Quigley	Swalwell (CA)
Meng	Rahall	Takano
Michaud	Rangel	Thompson (CA)
Miller, George	Richmond	Thompson (MS)
Moore	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Moran	Ruiz	Titus
Murphy (FL)	Ruppersberger	Tonko
Nadler	Rush	Tsongas
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Van Hollen
Neal	Sanchez, Linda	Vargas
Negrete McLeod	T.	Veasey
Nolan	Sanchez, Loretta	Vela
O'Rourke	Sarbanes	Velázquez
Owens	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Pallone	Schiff	Walz
Pascarell	Schneider	Wasserman
Pastor (AZ)	Schrader	Schultz
Payne	Schwartz	Waters
Pelosi	Scott (VA)	Waxman
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Welch
Peters (CA)	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
Peters (MI)	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth
Peterson	Shea-Porter	
	Sherman	

NAYS—219

Aderholt	Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)
Amash	Gosar	Neugebauer
Amodei	Gowdy	Noem
Bachmann	Granger	Nugent
Bachus	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Barletta	Graves (MO)	Olson
Barr	Griffin (AR)	Paulsen
Barton	Griffith (VA)	Pearce
Benishek	Grimm	Perry
Bentivolio	Guthrie	Petri
Bilirakis	Hall	Pittenger
Black	Hanna	Pitts
Blackburn	Harper	Poe (TX)
Boustany	Harris	Posey
Brady (TX)	Hartzler	Price (GA)
Bridenstine	Hastings (WA)	Reed
Brooks (AL)	Heck (NV)	Reichert
Brooks (IN)	Hensarling	Renacci
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Ribble
Bucshon	Holding	Rice (SC)
Burgess	Hudson	Rigell
Byrne	Huelskamp	Roby
Calvert	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Camp	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Cantor	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Carter	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Cassidy	Issa	Rokita
Chabot	Jenkins	Rooney
Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Clawson (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Coble	Jolly	Ross
Coffman	Jordan	Rothfus
Cole	Joyce	Royce
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Runyan
Collins (NY)	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	King (NY)	Salmon
Cook	Kinzingler (IL)	Sanford
Cotton	Kline	Scalise
Cramer	Labrador	Schock
Crawford	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Culberson	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Daines	Lankford	Sessions
Davis, Rodney	Latham	Shimkus
Denham	Latta	Shuster
Dent	LoBiondo	Simpson
DeSantis	Long	Smith (MO)
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Southerland
Ellmers	Massie	Stewart
Farr	McCarthy (CA)	Stivers
Fattah	McCaul	Stockman
Foster	McClintock	Stutzman
Frankel (FL)	McHenry	Terry
Fudge	McKeon	Thompson (PA)
Gabbard	McKinley	Thornberry
Gabard	McMorris	Tiberi
Gallego	Rodgers	Tipton
Garamendi	Meadows	Turner
Garcia	Meehan	Upton
Grayson	Messer	Valadao
Green, Al	Mica	Wagner
Green, Gene	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Grijalva	Miller (MI)	Walden
Gutiérrez	Miller, Gary	Walorski
Hahn	Mullin	Weber (TX)
Hastings (FL)	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)
Higgins		
Himes		
Hinojosa		
Holt		

Wenstrup	Wittman	Yoho
Westmoreland	Wolf	Young (AK)
Whitfield	Womack	Young (IN)
Williams	Woodall	
Wilson (SC)	Yoder	

NOT VOTING—18

Bass	Hanabusa	Marchant
Bishop (UT)	Heck (WA)	McAllister
Campbell	Honda	Nunnelee
Capito	Jackson Lee	Palazzo
DesJarlais	Kingston	Pompeo
Gingrey (GA)	Lewis	Rogers (MI)

□ 1725

Messrs. GARRETT and DENHAM changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. FATTAH changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 187, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 449]

YEAS—227

Aderholt	Ellmers	King (NY)
Amodei	Enyart	Kinzing (IL)
Bachus	Fincher	Kline
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	Kuster
Barr	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Barrow (GA)	Fleming	Lamborn
Barton	Flores	Lance
Benishek	Forbes	Lankford
Bentivolio	Fortenberry	Latham
Bera (CA)	Foster	Latta
Bilirakis	Foxo	LoBiondo
Black	Franks (AZ)	Loebsack
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Long
Boustany	Gallego	Lucas
Brady (TX)	Garamendi	Luetkemeyer
Braley (IA)	Garcia	Lummis
Brooks (AL)	Gardner	Maffei
Brooks (IN)	Gerlach	Maloney, Sean
Brownley (CA)	Gibbs	Marino
Buchanan	Gibson	Matheson
Bucshon	Goodlatte	McAllister
Burgess	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Bustos	Gowdy	McCarthy (NY)
Byrne	Granger	McCaul
Calvert	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Camp	Griffin (AR)	McHenry
Cantor	Griffith (VA)	McIntyre
Carter	Grimm	McKeon
Cassidy	Guthrie	McKinley
Chabot	Hall	McMorris
Chaffetz	Hanna	Rodgers
Coble	Harper	Meadows
Coffman	Harris	Meehan
Cole	Hartzler	Messer
Collins (GA)	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Collins (NY)	Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)
Cook	Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)
Cotton	Holding	Miller, Gary
Cramer	Horsford	Mullin
Crawford	Hudson	Murphy (FL)
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)
Culberson	Hultgren	Neugebauer
Daines	Hunter	Noem
Davis, Rodney	Hurt	Nolan
DeFazio	Issa	Nugent
Denham	Jenkins	Nunes
Dent	Johnson (OH)	Olson
DeSantis	Johnson, Sam	Owens
Diaz-Balart	Jolly	Paulsen
Duffy	Jordan	Pearce
Duncan (SC)	Joyce	Perlmutter
Duncan (TN)	Kelly (PA)	Perry

Peters (CA)	Rothfus	Thompson (PA)
Peters (MI)	Ruiz	Thornberry
Peterson	Runyan	Tiberi
Petri	Ryan (WI)	Tierney
Pittenger	Salmon	Tipton
Pitts	Scalise	Turner
Price (GA)	Schneider	Upton
Rahall	Schock	Valadao
Reed	Scott, Austin	Wagner
Reichert	Sensenbrenner	Walberg
Renacci	Sessions	Walden
Ribble	Shea-Porter	Walorski
Rice (SC)	Shimkus	Walz
Rigell	Shuster	Wenstrup
Roby	Simpson	Whitfield
Roe (TN)	Smith (MO)	Williams
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Wittman
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Rokita	Southerland	Womack
Rooney	Stewart	Yoder
Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers	Yoho
Roskam	Stutzman	Young (AK)
Ross	Terry	Young (IN)

NAYS—187

Amash	Graves (GA)	O'Rourke
Bachmann	Grayson	Pallone
Barber	Green, Al	Pascarell
Beatty	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Grijalva	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Hahn	Pingree (ME)
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Pocan
Bonamici	Hensarling	Poe (TX)
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Polis
Bridenstine	Himes	Posey
Broun (GA)	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Holt	Quigley
Butterfield	Hoyer	Rangel
Capps	Huelskamp	Richmond
Capuano	Huffman	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Israel	Ruppersberger
Carney	Jeffries	Rush
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Jones	T.
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Keating	Sanford
Ciilline	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schiff
Clawson (FL)	Kilmer	Schrader
Clay	Kind	Schwartz
Cleaver	King (IA)	Schweikert
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Labrador	Scott, David
Conaway	Langevin	Serrano
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Sinema
Costa	Levin	Sires
Courtney	Lipinski	Slaughter
Crowley	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lowenthal	Speier
Cummings	Lowe	Stockman
Davis (CA)	Lujan Grisham	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	(NM)	Takano
DeGette	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Lynch	Titus
DelBene	Maloney,	Tonko
Deutch	Carolyn	Tsongas
Dingell	Massie	Van Hollen
Doggett	Matsui	Vargas
Doyle	McCollum	Veasey
Duckworth	McDermott	Vela
Edwards	McGovern	Velázquez
Ellison	McNerney	Visclosky
Engel	Meeks	Wasserman
Eshoo	Meng	Schultz
Esty	Michaud	Waters
Farenthold	Miller, George	Waxman
Farr	Moore	Weber (TX)
Fattah	Moran	Webster (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Mulvaney	Welch
Fudge	Nadler	Westmoreland
Gabbard	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Garrett	Neal	Woodall
Gohmert	Negrete McLeod	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Bass	Hanabusa	Marchant
Bishop (UT)	Heck (WA)	Nunnelee
Campbell	Honda	Palazzo
Capito	Jackson Lee	Pompeo
DesJarlais	Kingston	Rogers (MI)
Gingrey (GA)	Lewis	Royce

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1731

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 449 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

TRIBUTE TO THE 193 DUTCH NATIONALS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES ON MALAYSIAN AIRLINES FLIGHT 17

(Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as cochair of the Dutch Caucus here in the U.S. House of Representatives, I rise today with a heavy heart to express our condolences at the tragic loss of life of nearly 300 people on Malaysian Airlines Flight 17.

On that flight, there was one American and a number of others from Australia, Malaysia, and a number of other countries. But counted among those were 193 Dutch nationals. Just to put that in perspective, that is like having a country the size of the United States lose over 3,600 people. That is the impact that it has had with our friends in the Netherlands. This attack on innocent civilians can only be described, I believe, as an act of terror, as it was flying over Ukrainian airspace.

We are rising today jointly, in a bipartisan fashion, to express our condolences to our friends in the Netherlands. The Netherlands was the first nation to ever recognize our Nation, the United States of America, officially back during the Revolutionary War. And they have been stalwart partners and stalwart friends throughout the history of our country.

With that, I yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend and colleague for yielding. I am honored to stand with him and all of us in solidarity with the people of the Netherlands and the families and loved ones of all the victims of that act of terror.

We look forward to working together to make sure that this situation is resolved as quickly as possible and the perpetrators are held accountable. I know we all stand together on that as well. And I am grateful to my colleague from Michigan for bringing us together for this purpose.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today we humbly ask our colleagues to join us in a moment of silence as we pay our respects and honor

the memory of all 298 passengers aboard MH17 that had their lives tragically cut short.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members please rise for a moment of silence.

PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 207, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

YEAS—205

Barber	Doyle	Lee (CA)
Barrow (GA)	Duckworth	Levin
Beatty	Edwards	Lipinski
Becerra	Ellison	LoBiondo
Bera (CA)	Engel	Loeb sack
Bishop (GA)	Enyart	Lofgren
Bishop (NY)	Eshoo	Lowenthal
Blumenauer	Esty	Lowe
Bonamici	Farr	Lujan Grisham
Brady (PA)	Fattah	(NM)
Braley (IA)	Fitzpatrick	Luján, Ben Ray
Brown (FL)	Foster	(NM)
Brownley (CA)	Frankel (FL)	Lynch
Bustos	Fudge	Maffei
Butterfield	Gabbard	Maloney,
Capps	Gallego	Carolyn
Capuano	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean
Cárdenas	Garcia	Matheson
Carney	Gibson	Matsui
Carson (IN)	Grayson	McCarthy (NY)
Cartwright	Green, Al	McCollum
Castor (FL)	Green, Gene	McDermott
Castro (TX)	Grijalva	McGovern
Chu	Gutiérrez	McIntyre
Ciilline	Hahn	McNerney
Clark (MA)	Harper	Meng
Clarke (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Michaud
Clay	Heck (NV)	Miller (MI)
Cleaver	Higgins	Miller, George
Clyburn	Himes	Moore
Cohen	Hinojosa	Moran
Connolly	Holt	Murphy (FL)
Conyers	Horsford	Nadler
Cooper	Hoyer	Napolitano
Costa	Huffman	Neal
Courtney	Israel	Negrete McLeod
Crowley	Jeffries	Nolan
Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Pallone
Davis, Danny	Keating	Pascarell
DeFazio	Kelly (IL)	Pastor (AZ)
DeGette	Kennedy	Payne
Delaney	Kildee	Pearce
DeLauro	Kilmer	Pelosi
DelBene	Kind	Perlmutter
Denham	Kirkpatrick	Peters (CA)
Dent	Kuster	Peters (MI)
Deutch	Langevin	Peterson
Dingell	Larsen (WA)	Pingree (ME)
Doggett	Larson (CT)	Pocan

Polis	Schrader	Titus
Price (NC)	Schwartz	Tonko
Quigley	Scott (VA)	Tsongas
Rahall	Scott, David	Upton
Rangel	Serrano	Van Hollen
Richmond	Sewell (AL)	Vargas
Roybal-Allard	Shea-Porter	Veasey
Royce	Sherman	Vela
Ruiz	Sinema	Velázquez
Ruppersberger	Sires	Visclosky
Rush	Slaughter	Walz
Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Wasserman
Sánchez, Linda	Speier	Schultz
T.	Swalwell (CA)	Waters
Sanchez, Loretta	Takano	Waxman
Sarbanes	Terry	Welch
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Schiff	Thompson (MS)	Wolf
Schneider	Tierney	Yarmuth

NAYS—207

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Perry
Amash	Graves (MO)	Petri
Amodei	Griffin (AR)	Pittenger
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Bachus	Grimm	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Guthrie	Posey
Barr	Hall	Price (GA)
Barton	Hanna	Reed
Benishek	Harris	Reichert
Bentivolio	Hartzler	Renacci
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Ribble
Black	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Boustany	Holding	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Rokita
Buchanan	Hurt	Rooney
Buchon	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Jenkins	Roskam
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Camp	Jolly	Runyan
Cantor	Jones	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Jordan	Salmon
Cassidy	Joyce	Sanford
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Schock
Clawson (FL)	King (NY)	Schweikert
Coble	Kinzinger (IL)	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Kline	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Labrador	Sessions
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Shuster
Conaway	Lance	Simpson
Cook	Lankford	Smith (MO)
Cotton	Latham	Smith (NE)
Cramer	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	Long	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Lucas	Southerland
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Daines	Lummis	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Marino	Stockman
DeSantis	Massie	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	McAllister	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Turner
Ellmers	McHenry	Valadao
Farenthold	McKeon	Wagner
Fincher	McKinley	Walberg
Fleischmann	McMorris	Walden
Fleming	Rodgers	Walorski
Flores	Meadows	Weber (TX)
Forbes	Meehan	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Messer	Wenstrup
Fox	Mica	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Wilson (SC)
Gardner	Mullin	Wittman
Garrett	Mulvaney	Womack
Gerlach	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Yoder
Gohmert	Noem	Yoho
Goodlatte	Nugent	Young (AK)
Gosar	Nunes	Young (IN)
Gowdy	Olson	
Granger	Paulsen	

NOT VOTING—20

Bass	Gingrey (GA)	Kingston
Bishop (UT)	Hanabusa	Lewis
Campbell	Heck (WA)	Marchant
Capito	Honda	Meeks
DesJarlais	Jackson Lee	

Nunnelee	Pompeo	Tiberi
Palazzo	Rogers (MI)	Whitfield

□ 1743

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4098

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor from H.R. 4098.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3230, the conference report on Veterans Access and Accountability.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Rahall moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to—

(1) recede from disagreement with section 203 of the Senate amendment (relating to the use of unobligated amounts to hire additional health care providers for the Veterans Health Administration); and

(2) recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment in all other instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's notice will appear in the RECORD.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Brownley of California moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an

Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to—

(1) recede from disagreement with title V of the Senate amendment (relating to health care related to sexual trauma); and

(2) recede from the House amendment and concur in the Senate amendment in all other instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7(b) of rule XXII, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the military sexual trauma provisions that were included in the Senate-passed H.R. 3230 and to urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to instruct conferees to accept these provisions.

As you know, the statistics on military sexual assault are staggering. In 2012, a Pentagon survey estimated that 26,000 women and men were sexually assaulted. However, the Pentagon only received 3,374 formal allegations. Clearly, there remains a deep-seated cultural problem in the military that discourages our servicemen and -women from coming forward to report cases of sexual assault.

Nonetheless, if one counts those cases reported, more and more men and women are currently leaving the military with PTSD from sexual assault. This cannot continue. Military sexual assault is the ultimate violation of the basic principles of trust, respect, honor, and dignity that is the bedrock of the principles our military men and women expect and deserve, and they are principles our country rightly demands.

Changing culture, as anyone from the public or private sectors know, and those of us dealing with issues at the Veterans Administration know all too well, changing culture is very difficult. But the culture of our military must change, and we, my colleagues, need to accelerate that change, from the military chain of command to reforms of our military justice system.

Clearly, preventing military sexual assault in the first place is critical, but it is equally critical that we provide servicemembers leaving the military who have suffered from sexual assault, to make access to care at the VA easier and safer, to make sure survivors get the benefits and services they need, and to ensure that the VA provides the very best treatment possible.

Compassion and care are a critical part of healing for those who have been sexually assaulted. We need an environment where it is safe to speak up and where we would never find anyone's story unjustly dismissed or treated with indifference, which would only make the trauma and the wound even deeper.

We have a bill before us that provides relief not only for those who have endured sexual assault, but for so many of the issues facing our veterans at this very moment.

I deeply appreciate the leadership from our chairman on the committee, who has done a tremendous amount to help our veterans, and he continues to do so. But the time to act is now. The crisis is clear. We have a path to address it. We have veterans who deserve it, and we have a Congress willing to provide the resources needed.

We have said time and time again in our hearings we need big change and big ideas. We need real transformation, and, most importantly, we need a VA whose sole purpose and mission is to serve our veterans with the same vigor and sacrifice that our veterans have served our country.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans must come first in everything we do. There is a lot of work ahead of us that the VA needs to do, and our committee must continue to do so. Persistent and consistent oversight every step of the way on our part will leverage the leadership and the strategic plan from within the VA to ensure that we deliver timely and quality health care with a compassion that our veterans and their families have earned and deserve.

I have no doubt that the leadership of the chairman has been instrumental to our committee's being able to work together in a bipartisan fashion to get us to this point, and it is imperative that we continue to work in a bipartisan fashion. Our veterans are counting on us, and our country is counting on us.

As ranking member of the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Health and someone who has respected all of the work of the committee on these issues, it is my belief that our veterans simply cannot and should not wait another day.

We have a bill that the Senate has passed and that we know the House would pass. We are currently scheduled by the Speaker to recess next Thursday. If the Speaker keeps to that timeline, we need to accept what is on the table: a bill that we know can pass both Houses and that we know the President will sign so that our veterans receive the care they deserve. We must include the provisions to improve VA treatment for survivors of military sexual trauma.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to instruct conferees, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to instruct and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to instruct would require the House to recede to the Senate amendments to H.R. 3230. As Chairman MILLER has stated during debate on nearly identical motions to instruct last week and again last night, the foremost goals of the House and Senate conference committee are, one,

to improve timely access to high-quality health care for veterans who have been waiting for weeks, months, or even years; and, two, to improve the accountability and overall operations of the Department of Veterans Affairs health care system. This was the central charge to the conferees at the beginning of the conference and remains so today. I have no doubt that my colleague from California, Congresswoman BROWNLEY, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health, shares these goals. However, this motion does not further our pursuit of them.

Tonight, our attention is best spent devoted to finding a true compromise—one that best serves our Nation's veterans and taxpayers and lays the foundation for correcting the departmental deficiencies that have brought us here—and not tying the conference committee's hands with an unnecessary, unhelpful, unbinding, and time-consuming motion to instruct.

As the gentlewoman knows, because she was in the Veterans' Affairs Committee hearing with the acting VA Secretary, this morning, Chairman MILLER offered a proposal that would largely agree with nearly everything in the Senate bill, with a few minor exceptions.

Chairman MILLER's proposal would accept title I through title VII of the original Senate bill, with amended language to include all 27 leases authorized by the House last December in H.R. 3521 rather than the 26 that the Senate approved; provide VA with \$102 million for fiscal year 2014 to address the Department's internal funding shortfalls; provide \$10 billion of no-year, mandatory, emergency funding to cover the cost of the Senate's choice provisions, with the remaining Senate provisions subject to appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I am supportive of Chairman MILLER's proposal because it is a fair, commonsense approach that ensures Congress is able to continue its oversight to ensure that taxpayers' funds are spent wisely.

As we all know, recently, Senator SANDERS, chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee and cochair of the conference committee, has indicated his desire to expand the scope of the conference to include VA's recent request for an additional \$17.6 billion. We call that an airdrop. Unfortunately, there is virtually no parachute in the form of detailed justification for this request, and to a great extent, Congress' acceptance of unsubstantiated funding requests in the past have helped get us to where we are today.

This summer, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has held multiple full committee oversight hearings to discuss the access and accountability failures VA has been subjecting our veterans to. These hearings have confirmed that the problems VA is facing today require long-term and large-scale reform. Adding more money, more people, and more infrastructure

to a system that has not proven itself able to make effective use of its existing resources that it has been provided without first implementing underlying reforms does not serve our veterans well and will not prevent them from continuing to face unacceptably long patient waiting times.

It has been proven time and time again by the VA inspector general, the Government Accountability Office, the administration, and others that VA has been suffering from widespread data manipulation and a systemic lack of integrity.

Given that, what confidence do we have that the \$17.6 billion resource request that VA is now making is based on data that is valid or reliable, particularly given that the committee has received very little analysis, justification, or verification of these numbers?

Before Congress can contemplate devoting such a significant amount of taxpayer money, it is imperative that VA provide a full accounting of each additional dollar that is being requested. The resource request the Department has put forward so far is not the well thought-out and thoroughly justifiable position that our Nation's veterans and our taxpayers deserve. Rather, it is an unsubstantiated guess put together in the back room of a massive bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe we could have already come to an agreement if Senator SANDERS would not have insisted on moving the goalposts so dramatically. The House has passed almost a dozen bills reforming the VA that have waited months for Senate consideration. The Senate could pass those bills and send them to the President to become law today.

I would remind Ms. BROWNLEY that one such bill, H.R. 2527, would extend VA's military sexual trauma counseling, along with care and treatment programs, for veterans for sexual trauma that occurred during Active Duty or Active Duty for training to veterans who experienced such trauma during inactive duty training.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, we are continually trying to work out a deal with the Senate, but I would submit to this body these motions to instruct are unproductive, are slowing down the conference process, and have become nothing more than a political ploy to distract from the true issues facing our veterans and the conference committee.

So with that, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the motion to instruct.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I just want to recognize my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado. He has worked hard on this committee. I want to make clear that what we are talking about today is the bill that passed the Senate 93-3. So we are not talking about an airdrop or moving the goalpost; we are talking about the bill that passed out of the Senate 93-3.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) who has been a leader on this issue and introduced the Military Sexual Trauma Claims Administration Reform and Eligibility Act.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from California for yielding to me, and for addressing this important issue of coverage for victims of sexual assault in the National Guard.

I rise in support of the Brownley motion to instruct. As you have heard described, this proposal addresses an unacceptable gap in current law that effectively leaves some victims of military sexual assault without the support and treatment they need.

Members of the National Guard and other reserve components of the armed services have fought bravely for our country, many completing numerous tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan. Since the attacks on September 11, more than 50,000 guardsmen and guardswomen have been called to service both at home and abroad. We recognize the value of their service, of the National Guard, and of other reserve components, and we thank them for their sacrifice.

Unfortunately, some guardsmen and -women, like other members of the armed services, are victimized by sexual assault while on Active Duty. If that happens, they are provided all of the VA resources and services they need to recover and heal, physically and emotionally. These benefits, however, are not offered to members of the National Guard or other reserve components who experience sexual assault while on inactive training missions. For example, members of the Guard are required to participate in training missions one weekend a month and two weeks a year, but benefits and services, such as counseling and medical care, do not extend to victims sexually assaulted during those mandatory training missions. This oversight is simply unacceptable and leaves so many who have served our country so bravely without assistance or support during a devastating time.

On May 28, the House unanimously agreed to a solution to this problem by passing legislation I introduced last year, the bipartisan National Guard Military Sexual Trauma Parity Act. This legislation is supported by a number of the leading veterans service organizations.

The National Guard Military Sexual Trauma Parity Act would fix this omission and clarify that all victims of sexual trauma in the National Guard or other reserve components have access to the care they need to help them recover from acts of sexual trauma while they are on inactive or reserve duty.

The Senate wisely included this language in the VA reform bill that passed their body 93-3, and it is important that this provision, which has been passed by the House already, be in-

cluded in the final version of the bill. I was pleased to hear it mentioned by our colleague from Colorado, so I am glad that there is support for keeping it in the conference report.

I encourage my colleagues to support the Brownley motion to instruct to ensure that all victims of sexual assault, regardless of what kind of duty they are on, have access to the care they need.

Mr. LAMBORN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), a valued and insightful member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BROWNLEY for her friendship and for her commitment to our Nation's veterans.

I rise to support the Brownley motion to instruct the conferees on H.R. 3230. It has been one of the most humble honors for me to serve on the Veterans' Affairs committee, one of the most bipartisan committees in this Congress.

This week I had the honor to join my constituent, Sergeant Ryan Pitts, as he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Honor at the White House, and my husband and I joined Ryan and his wife, Amy, and their son, Luke, at the Pentagon as he was inducted into the Hall of Fame. He honored his colleagues, the chosen few who lost their lives in Afghanistan, and on his behalf and on their behalf it is a tremendous privilege for me to continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in service to our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, we were all shocked and outraged when our committee uncovered long wait times, secret wait lists, and manipulated records at the Veterans Administration. When our men and women in uniform return home after fighting for our freedom, they should never ever have to fight just to receive the medical care that they have earned and they deserve. That is why I was proud to work with Republicans and Democrats to pass common-sense reforms to hold VA leaders accountable and increase access to care for our veterans.

I also partnered with the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) to cosponsor legislation that puts forward even stronger VA reforms and which has already passed in the Senate. Both Chambers of Congress have passed bipartisan bills in response to the scandal at the VA, and now it is time to finish the job and reconcile this legislation.

We owe it to our veterans to stay right here in Washington and to work together until we can send a final bill to the President's desk to improve care for all our veterans. And we must ensure that this final legislation contains strong protections for veteran survivors of sexual trauma.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, sexual assault in our military is a full-blown epidemic. According to the Department of Defense, an estimated 26,000 servicemembers have suffered unwanted sexual contact in just 2012 alone. This is an outrage. When a young woman or a young man signs up to serve our country, they know that they may face danger in combat, but it is unacceptable that so many of these brave Americans are attacked every year by their own colleagues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. KUSTER. It is unacceptable that so many of our brave Americans are attacked every year by their own colleagues. And when survivors come forward, which only happens a fraction of the time, our flawed military justice system often turns a blind eye.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to work across the aisle with our colleagues, JACKIE WALORSKI, LORETTA SANCHEZ, and many others to pass strong whistleblower protections into law and help prevent retaliation against those who bravely report these crimes. We need to continue to work together, and I implore our colleagues to join us in voting "yes" on the motion to instruct and to guarantee that our veterans will be protected.

I again partnered with Representative WALORSKI to introduce legislation to extend VA travel benefits to veterans travelling to seek treatment for injuries resulting from sexual trauma.

Republican and Democrat alike, so many of us fought to reform our military justice system and transfer authority to independent prosecutors.

And together, this House passed the Ruth Moore Act to help ensure that veterans suffering from sexual trauma have access to the services they need.

In a Congress bogged down by gridlock and partisanship, this issue has united both parties.

When working to rid our military of sexual assault, and to better serve its survivors, we have proven that Congress can still find common ground and solve problems.

So let's build on that progress and pass this motion, which would agree to Senate-passed language to expand VA services for the treatment of military sexual trauma.

In addition, this motion would improve coordination between the VA and Department of Defense.

These are goals that we can all support.

So I implore our colleagues—join us in voting yes, and let's continue the important work of protecting our service members from sexual assault, and guaranteeing only the best care for those veterans who suffered from these crimes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) who has been an extraordinary leader and champion, and also

the cochair of the Military Sexual Assault Prevention Caucus.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman BROWNLEY for allowing me to speak on this very worthwhile motion, and I rise in support.

Statistics from the Department of Veterans Affairs indicate that as many as one in five women are sexually assaulted while serving in the military. But receiving benefits from the VA remains a challenge.

Last year, the Service Women's Action Network, the Yale Law School Veterans Legal Services Clinic, the ACLU, and the ACLU of Connecticut released a report showing that veterans who experience sexual assaults have their benefits claims denied more than veterans with other types of PTSD. The report also found the rate of granting these claims varied greatly depending on the particular VA regional office. The St. Paul, Minnesota, office granted only 26 percent of the military sexual trauma claims they received, while the office in Los Angeles granted more than 88 percent of the claims they received.

Anyone who has seen the powerful documentary "The Invisible War" has anguished along with Kori Cioca. Kori survived a horrific sexual assault while serving, and suffered severe injuries to her face and jaw incident to the assault. She waited for years for an answer from the VA on the jaw surgery she needed, but her claim was ultimately and shockingly denied.

The VA has a long way to go when it comes to granting benefits for survivors of military sexual trauma. The Senate provisions in section 503 of the Senate bill would make sure that Congress is better informed on how the VA is treating military sexual trauma.

Section 503 would also address what the VA is doing for male victims of sexual assault. According to the Defense Department, by the numbers, men in the military are more often victims of sexual assault than women.

Yesterday, Senator GILLIBRAND of New York screened a documentary at Capitol Hill called "Justice Denied." In it, male victims tell the heart-wrenching stories of being sexually assaulted, and too often being ignored by their commands after they reported an attack and isolated by their fellow servicemembers for doing so. We must do a better job—a much better job—of protecting these men and taking care of them after these incidents. The Senate bill allows us to start to do that.

Finally, section 501 expands eligibility for counseling services which are so important to people healing. About 2 years ago, a woman veteran came to my office to talk to me about being sexually assaulted while she was in the military. She hadn't spoken to many people about what had happened to her before, and it was difficult to do so. But she had just come from a summit where she had met a number of survivors just like her who had had similar experiences. This opportunity to

meet people with similar stories and share their experiences strengthened her. She was similarly strengthened through counseling and group therapy. She has become more and more comfortable speaking about her story because of the treatment she has received. I have now seen her bravely telling her story to a rapt audience after a screening of "The Invisible War."

I urge a "yes" vote on this very important motion that will help to improve care to so many servicemembers.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) who has been instrumental in reforming the Uniform Code of Military Justice in her role on the House Armed Services Committee.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California, whom I am honored to serve with and who I want to compliment for bringing recognition to this issue and a spotlight on the importance of providing this service to veterans when they are no longer in Active Duty.

The reason why this particular section 503 is so critical is because so few of these survivors ever come forward when they are on Active Duty to speak about their sexual assault. In fact, the military in many respects encourages them not to come forward because oftentimes the result is, when you do come forward, you are labeled as having a personality disorder and then honorably but involuntarily discharged from the military.

The stories I have heard over the last 3 or 4 years are really very disturbing because it makes the case over and over again that the military does not really want to deal with this issue.

□ 1815

So 26,000 sexual assaults or sexual harassments that take place to members of the military every year. 5,000—only 5,000 of them report them, only 500 of them go to court-martial, and only 250 see any kind of time in jail or prison.

There are many of these victims who upon retiring, upon being discharged from the military, are into drugs and alcohol, and all of a sudden find out that what is really driving their conditions is the fact that they were raped when they were in the military.

I had the opportunity just last week to spend some time at the MST program in Menlo Park, California, with five survivors who were in an inpatient program. They were all extraordinarily grateful for the opportunity they had to participate in that program.

They found it to be a lifesaver, literally a lifesaver. They were all on the brink before being admitted into this particular program and for the first time feel that they are getting their lives back, but one of the great eye-

opening parts of that experience was that, of the five women, four of them would be homeless upon leaving this in-treatment program, which went on for about 45 days.

On top of everything else that we are learning about MST, I think it is important to recognize that survivors, particularly women survivors—but I believe it is true of men survivors as well—need to be in programs that are single-sex because they have so many issues associated with it and that we have got to find housing for them after they leave.

With that, I support the motion.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who has also been a leader and advocate for justice for our survivors in the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me add my appreciation to Ms. BROWNLEY for her leadership on this issue and for the women that are on the floor who are members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and members of the Armed Services Committee, who really have led this issue, which I believe all of America understands.

Let me thank Mr. LAMBORN, who is from Colorado and a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and as we debate this motion to instruct, a personal plea to Mr. LAMBORN, that this is truly a reasoned response to the heinous number of women and some men in the United States military who have experienced traumatic sexual assault and trauma.

This is a simple motion to instruct. It asks us to cede to the provision in the Senate, which allows for the care, health care, under the veterans health care system, of those who have experienced sexual trauma.

As Ms. BROWNLEY has indicated, I am a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee, and we address these questions through the Judiciary Committee on issues of domestic violence and sexual assault and find ways, of course, to be able to respond to women who have been victimized.

We took a long time to pass the Violence Against Women Act, but the whole idea was to include an infrastructure to protect women who are frightened to come forward and to acknowledge the criminality of domestic violence and violence against women.

Can we do no less for the women in the United States military who put on the uniform and took an oath to swear allegiance to the United States and to extend their bodies on the front lines to be able to protect this Nation, can we not do any less than to offer to them simple health care when they come forward on sexual trauma?

Just a few years ago, I provided a PTSD center at one of my nonveteran or nonmilitary hospitals. It was overwhelmingly received by veterans who

were off campus and wanted to go to a place that was not as congested as a veterans hospital, but I will tell you that PTSD is truly a health phenomenon.

The distinctive sexual trauma that some of my colleagues have mentioned that women have hidden and never spoken about for years should not be rejected when they come forward finally because we have opened the system to be able to secure health care. They should not be, in essence, directed to a life of drug abuse and alcohol abuse because they are fearing. They should be able to get health care.

So I ask my colleagues, 26,000 and growing and others who are also involved, this is an important motion to instruct, and I congratulate, again, Ms. BROWNLEY. My heart breaks—as she served as the ranking member on the Health Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs—my heart breaks that when you are abused, when your face is abused, when your body is abused, that is a health crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Having just come back from my community where two women and families have been killed through the violence of domestic violence, they live no more—but what about those who are soldiers who put on the uniform who are experiencing a lifelong experience of injuries and psychological trauma?

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this motion to instruct offered by my colleague, Ms. BROWNLEY. What more can we do or how much less can we do for women and men who put on the uniform who are suffering from sexual trauma? It must be part of the Veterans' Affairs health reform.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire if the gentleman from Colorado will have any additional speakers?

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, there are no plans to have any additional speakers.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Then I am prepared to close.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I once again urge all Members to oppose the motion to instruct, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I would like to add that as ranking member of the Health Subcommittee, I led a hearing last July to address VA care and treatment for military sexual trauma survivors.

The subcommittee looked at the coordination of care and services offered by the Department of Defense and the VA. I was truly saddened to listen to the testimonies of those who spoke.

Their pain and suffering was evident in every word they spoke. I know it was hard for all of them to share their stories, and I know all of us understand the immense bravery it took for them to do so.

I know that all of us, including those who have come to speak today, are dedicated to addressing military sexual assault. The Senate bill takes an important step forward toward that end. It is but one very important reason why I call on my colleagues to support this motion to instruct.

Let's insist that the Department of Defense and the VA address the epidemic of military sexual assault, which must include appropriate care and treatment of trauma survivors, and let's adopt the language in the Senate bill that addresses military sexual trauma.

We have a bill before us that was crafted by Members of Congress whose dedication to our veterans is beyond question, but we are running out of time. We have a bill that we know will pass both Houses, that we know the President will sign, that we know will provide significant relief to our veterans immediately.

We simply cannot negotiate any longer. Time is of the essence. We should move forward. We should adopt the Senate bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to instruct conferees, and, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today, in my district, we buried Dr. Evelyn E. Thornton, the first African American to graduate from the University of Houston with a Ph.D. in math and a leader in civic matters and education.

Because of my responsibility of speaking at this civic leader's funeral home going service, I missed the following votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall vote No. 442, I would have voted "no" on the motion on ordering the previous question on H.R. 4935 and H.R. 3393;

On rollcall vote No. 443, I would have voted "no" on H. Res. 680, a rule providing for the consideration of H.R.

4935, Child Tax Credit Improvement Act, and H.R. 3393, Student and Family Tax Simplification Act;

On rollcall vote No. 444, I would have voted "yes" on an amendment to H.R. 4984, Empowering Students Through Enhanced Counseling Act, offered by Mr. KILMER and Mr. HINOJOSA;

On rollcall vote No. 445, I would have voted "yes" on a motion to recommit H.R. 4984, Empowering Students Through Enhanced Counseling Act;

On rollcall vote No. 446, I would have voted "yes" on final passage of H.R. 4984, Empowering Students Through Enhanced Counseling Act;

On rollcall vote No. 447, I would have voted "yes" on H.R. 5111, to improve the response to victims of sex trafficking, by Representative BEATTY;

On rollcall vote No. 448, I would have voted "yes" on a motion to recommit on H.R. 3933, Student and Family Tax Simplification Act;

On rollcall vote No. 449, I would have voted "no" on H.R. 3393, Student and Family Tax Simplification Act; and

On rollcall vote No. 450, I would have voted "yes" on H.R. 3230, Veterans' Access to Care Through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014.

16TH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPITOL SHOOTING

(Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the House observed a moment of silence to remember the loss of two heroes who gave their lives to protect others.

The deaths of Detective John Gibson and Officer Jacob Chestnut are heartbreaking. An additional tragedy, however, is that this House has not taken action to prevent such incidents from happening again.

The man who took the lives of the two police officers had paranoid schizophrenia and had previously been committed to a psychiatric hospital after threatening to kill the President, a hospital technician, and his neighbors. His paranoid delusions told him to attack the Capitol. Weston cycled in and out of emergency rooms as he refused medication and followup treatment.

We know that the perpetrator had a brain disease, but our broken mental health system prevents others like Weston from being treated. The sad truth of this situation is it won't be long before we read in the headlines of another preventable tragedy.

The memories of Detective Gibson and Officer Chestnut deserve our respect, their families our gratitude, but all families deserve our action.

We must pass H.R. 3717, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, because where there is no help there is no hope.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND FOR COOPERATION ON THE USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY FOR MUTUAL DEFENSE PURPOSES OF JULY 3, 1958—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-137)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to section 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the text of an amendment (the "Amendment") to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes of July 3, 1958, as amended (the "1958 Agreement"). I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Amendment. The joint unclassified letter submitted to me by the Secretaries of Defense and Energy providing a summary position on the unclassified portions of the Amendment is also enclosed. The joint classified letter and classified portions of the Amendment are being transmitted separately via appropriate channels.

The Amendment extends for 10 years (until December 31, 2024), provisions of the 1958 Agreement that permit the transfer between the United States and the United Kingdom of classified information concerning atomic weapons; nuclear technology and controlled nuclear information; material and equipment for the development of defense plans; training of personnel; evaluation of potential enemy capability; development of delivery systems; and the research, development, and design of military reactors. Additional revisions to portions of the Amendment and Annexes have been made to ensure consistency with current United States and United Kingdom policies and practice regarding nuclear threat reduction, naval nuclear propulsion, and personnel security.

In my judgment, the Amendment meets all statutory requirements. The United Kingdom intends to continue to maintain viable nuclear forces into the foreseeable future. Based on our previous close cooperation, and the fact that the United Kingdom continues to commit its nuclear forces to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, I have concluded it is in the United States national interest to continue to assist the

United Kingdom in maintaining a credible nuclear deterrent.

I have approved the Amendment, authorized its execution, and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 24, 2014.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. EVELYN E. THORNTON

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today, I was on official business in Houston, honoring the life of Dr. Evelyn Thornton. She was a great American. Dr. Thornton was the mother of two wonderful daughters: Yvonne Denise, a trained lawyer; and Wanda, an outstanding physician honored by all.

Dr. Thornton, who lost an eye in her early twenties, went on to be the first African American to receive a Ph.D. from the University of Houston, a school that African Americans could not go to for many, many years.

She was a member of the Links and Alpha Kappa Alpha, but what she was known for is 40 years of teaching. Evelyn was an educator who lifted the lives of young people at Prairie View A&M.

She was a graduate of Texas Southern University, got married, had grandchildren, great-grandchildren, daughter-in-laws and a son-in-law, Russell, a leader in the community.

What was most noted is the simplistic style that Evelyn had of humility and her willingness to serve the people.

I would say that today we laid to rest in Houston a great American, Dr. Evelyn E. Thornton, whose contributions should continue to be remembered.

CHILDREN ARE A VULNERABLE POPULATION

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, in this country, we have reached the consensus that victims of human trafficking should be provided help. That consensus was north-south, east-west, conservative-liberal, and Democrat-Republican. Human trafficking victims need protections.

Now there is a discussion of truncating that protection, and we must say that would be wrong. We know especially for child victims that special care must be taken to elicit the facts of what has happened. And the idea that we would short-circuit that process for children who are human trafficking victims at our border is unconscionable.

Now we have received a letter from the National Association of Immigration Judges telling us the ground

truth: that special care must be taken for child victims. These are not the same as other cases.

I include for the RECORD a letter from the National Association of Immigration Judges.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
IMMIGRATION JUDGES,
San Francisco, CA, July 22, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker,
House of Representatives.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader,
House of Representatives.

Re Special Concerns Relating to Juveniles in Immigration Courts

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER PELOSI: The National Association of Immigration Judges (NAIJ) is a voluntary organization formed in 1971 with the objectives of promoting independence and enhancing the professionalism, dignity, and efficiency of the Immigration Court. We are the recognized collective bargaining representative of the fewer than 230 Immigration Judges located in 59 courts throughout the United States.

Our nation's Immigration Court system is currently facing an unprecedented surge in the numbers of unaccompanied minors who have presented themselves at our southern border seeking shelter. As you and your colleagues consider how to address this complex and urgent situation, we would like to offer our expertise to help inform your decision-making. The opinions provided here do not purport to represent the views of the DOJ, the Executive Office for Immigration Review or the Office of the Chief Immigration Judge. Rather, they represent the formal position of the NAIJ, and my personal opinions, which were formed after extensive consultation with members of the NAIJ.

In the legal arena, it is universally accepted that children and juveniles are a vulnerable population with special needs. Since the passage of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act (TVPPRA) in 2008, Congress has codified special provisions such as non-adversarial adjudication of unaccompanied children's asylum claims and, to the extent practicable, access to legal services through pro bono representation. The law recognizes that these children are especially vulnerable to potential human trafficking and abuse. From the perspective of practicalities, because of their vulnerabilities and lack of full competency, Immigration Court cases involving children and juveniles must be conducted in a different manner than those of adults. Immigration Judges are charged with assuring that those who come before them understand their rights and responsibilities under governing law. For minors, it can be especially challenging to effectively communicate the complicated nuances of our law and the possible remedies which may be available to them. Immigration judges are trained to alter their demeanor and lexicon to adapt to the more limited life experiences and understanding of minors, but that alone is not enough. The judge must carefully gauge the response they receive to be sure that the minor truly understands what he or she is being told, rather than feigning compliance in order to please the judge as an authority figure.

Judges must assure that a minor is put at ease in an inherently stressful and unfamiliar setting. These precautions are not solely for the benefit of the minor, but are a practical necessity for a judge in order to obtain the information necessary to arrive at a fair and accurate result based on a true understanding of the child's situation. To do

so, an atmosphere of trust must be established, and a rapport developed which assures that the minor is both emotionally able and psychologically willing to discuss issues which may be embarrassing, shameful or traumatizing. In order to accomplish this, a judge frequently has to take more time than in the case of an adult to make the child feel sufficiently safe so as to fully participate in the hearing. This often involves multiple hearings, so that familiarity with the people, location and general process can ease tensions and inspire confidence.

Because many of the juveniles we see in proceedings come from countries where governmental authorities are corrupt or pose a danger to them, Immigration Judges need to be particularly aware of the environment in which their hearings are conducted, so that their neutrality and independence is clearly demonstrated, enabling a minor to address difficult issues without fear or a feeling of futility. We must go to great lengths to create an courtroom environment where our hearings are not perceived as coercive. Frequently we find that both children and adults who appear in Immigration Court do not understand the difference in the roles of the government trial attorneys and judges, and even when provided pro bono counsel, assume that everyone associated with the proceeding functions as a prosecutor or law enforcement official. At this early stage some of our judges have reported concerns about the lack of quality of interviews that have resulted in "negative credible fear" findings and summary deportation orders at the border. For all these reasons, it is particularly important that Immigration Judges be the ones charged with making these crucial determinations, rather than Border Patrol agents.

The complexity of a judge's job is increased exponentially due to the language and cultural differences which we routinely encounter, as well as the limitations upon minors who are not represented by attorneys. Under governing regulation, children under sixteen without responsible adults to help them cannot accept service of the charging documents which initiate removal proceedings, and those under fourteen without a responsible adult cannot enter pleadings to those charges. In addition, in the vast majority of cases, the burden of proof to demonstrate eligibility for relief rests on the minor, even though their ability to gather the evidence necessary to support their claim—whether it is personal documentation, general country conditions information or expert opinions—is greatly reduced because of their age. In many cases, the lack of corroborating evidence may be fatal to a claim for relief from removal. This is even more true for a child's case, since their ability to provide clear, consistent and detailed testimony that could support a claim without corroborating evidence may be compromised by their age.

All these factors lead inexorably to the conclusion that removal proceedings regarding juveniles should not be subject to strict time constraints regarding scheduling or decision-making. Judges need the ability to tailor the time frames of various aspects of the proceedings to the emotional, physical and psychological state of the individual in court. The ability to find local counsel or obtain supporting evidence and documentation can vary significantly depending on an individual's age, mental capacity and custodial circumstances.

The adage "haste makes waste" is apropos to the context of these cases, because speeding up or truncating the process creates an unacceptably high risk of legal errors which directly lead to higher rates of appeal. Rather than making the process move more

quickly overall, the opposite occurs as appeals cause a backlog and delay at the higher levels of our court systems, which in turn, drives up the fiscal costs of these proceedings. This effect has been proven by past experience when proceedings at the Board of Immigration Appeals were "streamlined" only to result in an outcry from the federal circuit courts and harsh criticism of the lack of proper records for them to review, resulting in remands rather than resolutions. Similarly, bypasses to Immigration Court proceedings such as expedited removal proceedings have been subject to serious criticisms by neutral observers, including the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom and United Nations High Commissioner on Refugees. In this situation, the concern is not that "haste makes waste," but that hasty decisions could result in loss of lives or limbs, by deporting individuals to a country where they face persecution.

It is our experience that when noncitizens are represented by attorneys, Immigration Judges are able to conduct proceedings more expeditiously and resolve cases more quickly. Judges have found that cases with legal representation generally 1) reduce the number and length of proceedings for benefits for which individuals are ineligible; 2) generally require fewer continuances for preparation (including when applications must be processed with other agencies); 3) obviate appeals based on a lack of understanding regarding legal rights or concerns about fairness; 4) take less hearing time for judges because they are better researched and organized; and 5) tend to reduce the number of futile claims which utterly lack a basis in the law. Because of those and several additional reasons why attorneys are beneficial to our process, allowing judges to grant reasonable requests for continuances, based on their knowledge of the local availability of low fee and pro bono counsel, ends up being the most time-efficient approach.

A due process review of the fundamental fairness of any proceeding requires consideration of three distinct factors: first, the nature of the private interest affected; second, the risk of an erroneous deprivation through the procedures used and the probable value of additional or substitute procedural safeguards; and finally, the fiscal and administrative burdens that those additional or substitute procedural requirements would place on the government. Immigration Judges are in the best position to guarantee due process, while at the same time efficiently and fairly conducting removal proceedings. However, to do so, they must be given the flexibility to balance the needs of the individual appearing in court with the interests of an expeditious adjudication based on the unique situation presented in each case. Rigid deadlines hamper rather than enhance that ability, and artificial constraints on the time necessary to fairly adjudicate cases will likely promote litigation, rather than resolve individual cases. For all these reasons, NAIJ strongly opposes the proposed implementation of a seven-day adjudication time frame for these cases.

With the proper allocation of resources to allow the hiring of sufficient Immigration Judges and support staff to assist them, we would be able to schedule all hearings within appropriate time frames. Justice would be served and legal challenges to individual outcomes reduced. While the need to address the surge in juveniles is seen as paramount now, the overall context of this crisis cannot be overlooked. As of today's date, there are only 228 full time Immigration Judges in field offices, handling a nationwide caseload of more than 375,500 cases. The average time to decision nationally has now climbed to 587 days. The unfortunate and ironic fact is that

with long delays, people whose cases will eventually be granted relief suffer, while those with cases which will ultimately be denied benefit. Individuals with "strong" cases are trapped in limbo inside the United States while family members abroad become ill and die, family members who can provide them with eligibility for an immigration benefit die, and their claim for relief becomes stale by the passage of time. Conversely, those individuals who do not qualify for benefits, or who have adverse discretionary factors making them undeserving of legal status are allowed to remain for years, possibly accruing eligibility for relief, while their cases are pending.

We believe that the totality of this situation deserves your immediate attention, so that fairness and balance can be assured to all who appear in our nation's Immigration Courts. If the general needs of our entire caseload are sacrificed to address the short term crisis, we fear that the overall reputation of the Immigration Court system will be damaged unnecessarily and irreparably.

Of course, if we can provide any additional information or answer specific questions you may have, please just let us know.

Very truly yours,

DANA LEIGH MARKS,
President.

□ 1830

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be here today on behalf of the Progressive Caucus, along with other members of the Progressive Caucus. We have long fought for the middle class and those aspiring to be in the middle class. Today, specifically, we want to address Congressman PAUL RYAN's plan to help alleviate poverty in this Nation.

Needless to say, we were excited to find out a Republican wanted to talk about poverty, given the votes that we have had this session in this body. Whether it be the draconian cuts that appeared in the House Republican budget, the slashing of food stamps and assistance to the most needy in this country, to see a Republican finally stand up and talk about poverty, we were excited. And we want to have that conversation this evening.

So just what is in Congressman PAUL RYAN's plan to help alleviate poverty? I am sure it must be something about raising the minimum wage to \$10.10 in the next 3 years so that we can help lift people who are making \$15,000 a year out of poverty. I am sure it addresses equal pay for equal work so that men and women are paid for doing the same work. But it doesn't appear that is part of PAUL RYAN's plan.

I am sure it addresses some educational issues. I am sure it helps people pay back their loans at lower rates and makes sure we have expanded Pell grants available so that no one should be denied a higher education simply because they can't afford it. No, that is not part of the Ryan plan either.

I am sure there is an investment in early childhood education, because every person in this room must surely know that if we help invest at those earliest years, you can have a lifetime of experiences and opportunities for someone. That is not in the plan either.

Surely, it must address investments in infrastructure. We have crumbling roads and bridges. We have bridges and roads that are old enough that they are eligible for Medicare in this country. Surely, putting people back to work at a time like this and investing in our infrastructure would make sense. It is also not in the Ryan plan.

Let me try one more thing. It has got to be here. We must provide incentives to create good-paying jobs here in America rather than overseas. Clearly, the 21st century Make It In America Act must not be in the plan either.

All those things that I just mentioned—raising the minimum wage, making sure we have equal pay for equal work, expanding opportunity through expanded Pell grants and helping people refinance their student loans, helping people get access to early education and investing in our infrastructure and jobs here at home—are part of the House Democratic Middle Class Jumpstart program. They are what we would do in our first 100 days if we were to take over the majority after this fall.

But surely there must be something we could talk about today in PAUL RYAN's plan. There has got to be something equally bold and, hopefully, not just old, a bunch of old ideas warmed over, brought back to us in versions of block grants and not really providing any real assistance that the most needy in this country need.

I am joined by a number of my colleagues today who are going to address exactly what is in PAUL RYAN's plan and perhaps how we can offer a little different perspective to help the most needy in our country.

I would like to start out with a very esteemed and respected colleague from Illinois, Representative DANNY DAVIS.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you very much. I am pleased to be here to join you, Mr. POCAN, and other members of the Progressive Caucus as we talk about the real deal in terms of what it is that you do to reduce poverty.

I read some of what we are talking about, and I really couldn't believe that that had anything to do with the reduction or any efforts to seriously reduce poverty.

We have made some progress in the last 50 years, but it is unacceptable that 49.7 million people, including 13 million children, were poor in 2012. In my congressional district alone, 41 percent of children, or 67,000 children, live in poverty. It also is shameful that racial disparities remain in the experience of poverty, with child poverty for African Americans being 29.2 percent, in 2012, compared to 9 percent for their White peers.

And so I welcome working with anybody that would like to reduce poverty. As a matter of fact, ever since I have been here, I have championed two of the chief proposals mentioned by the Ryan plan: expanding the earned income tax credit to childless and non-custodial parents, as well as reducing incarceration among low-risk and non-violent offenders.

The earned income tax credit is one of the most effective antipoverty programs that we have. A Brookings Institution report highlights that the high rate of incarceration in our country exacts considerable cost from American taxpayers, especially from State governments and families.

However, I am extremely concerned about the proposed way of paying for these programs. Rather than asking large corporations to pay their fair share of taxes or closing international tax loopholes that allow large, multinational companies to evade billions of dollars in taxes, the Ryan plan would eliminate or eviscerate many important programs like the Social Services Block Grant and the Economic Development Administration.

So I don't know what Mr. RYAN is really talking about. It seems to me that he is talking the same talk we have heard so often.

Ms. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POCAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. DAVIS, you are a member of the Ways and Means Committee so perhaps we can seek some clarification on the earned income tax credit expansion, which you say you have championed, and that is a very effective antipoverty program, one of the elements in the Ryan antipoverty program that you say is a good feature but you object to the pay-for for the expansion of the earned income tax credit.

In order to expand it to folks up to age 64, as he proposes, which is a great idea—and incentives work, because he says a lot of poor people don't want to work—this would enable low-income people to have that subsidy through the Tax Code, as we benefit many corporations that same way.

Just recently, the Ways and Means Committee just extended about \$618 billion of corporate taxes. I am wondering what the pay-for for these corporate extenders were.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. They didn't really deal with pay-fors. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons that many of us objected to the piecemeal way in which the Republicans are looking at what we call tax reform is we have been trying to move towards comprehensive tax reform where you look at all of the taxation that we are doing. And yes, there would be what is called some losers and some winners, but you wouldn't cherry pick and just give corporate giveaways and not do things like make sure that you have got the new market tax credits in, which are designed to help redevelop,

restore, and reconstitute communities that are hurting, that are seriously underfunded and don't have things.

Many communities in my district which were actually burned out by the riots after the death of Dr. Martin Luther King are still burned out.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. DAVIS, that was very confusing to me, and I will take my seat, but I just wanted clarification on that.

The earned income tax credit, which is a benefit that is provided to ordinary Americans through the Tax Code, we are required to eviscerate programs like Meals on Wheels for elders through the Social Services Block Grant and to get rid of maybe some of the low-income heating programs that heat homes in places like Chicago that are cold in order to pay for an expansion of the earned income tax credit, but the \$618 billion in tax cuts which were designed to be just temporary but you made permanent the other day, I guess you pay for it by not giving unemployment compensation to people.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Let's say the majority on the committee made it permanent because we voted—that is, those of us who are Democrats voted against it. That is why I think it is so important that we are here this evening.

I just simply want to again commend Mr. POCAN for taking the leadership to bring us together and give us the opportunity to discuss these issues.

I just say: Right on, my brother. I am glad to be here with you.

□ 1845

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative DAVIS, so much for all of your advocacy on behalf of those who are struggling to be in the middle class and for making sure we can try to reduce poverty.

Representative DAVIS is right. There are a couple of nuggets that are in the Ryan proposal that make sense. I think there could be bipartisan support for criminal sentencing reform. There should be, and it is long past due, and it is good to see that proposed in the plan.

As Representative GWEN MOORE from Milwaukee so eloquently put forth, expanding tax credits for childless workers is something through the earned income tax credit we would support except that, perhaps, the Ryan proposal doesn't quite fund it in a way that makes sense.

So there are a few nuggets in there, but there is an awful lot that really doesn't do much about reducing poverty and, in fact, would probably, very likely, increase poverty in the near term.

I would like to yield to another colleague of mine, to someone who has been this body's, really, most outspoken person in talking about poverty. She is leading a task force for the Democratic Caucus that specifically addresses poverty. I would like to yield to my great colleague from the State

of California, Representative BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much.

Let me thank you, Mr. POCAN, for yielding but also for organizing, not only this Special Order tonight, but for having these Special Orders in order to really raise a level of awareness with regard to these important issues facing millions of Americans in our country. We know that you are here every week, sometimes by yourself, but I have to thank you for your tremendous leadership and for helping the Progressive Caucus continue to beat the drum on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we all know today that, of course, the Republican Budget Committee chair, PAUL RYAN, rolled out his expanding opportunities for all plan for addressing poverty in America. That is what it is called.

I can say, like you, I am happy to see that there are some areas we can work on together in this plan. That includes fixing our broken criminal justice system, expanding and supporting the earned income tax credit if we don't, as his plan calls for, rob Peter to pay Paul. I am glad to see that the conversation on poverty in this country is finally catching up and catching on with my Republican colleagues at the national level.

We have been working for a long time—our task force, you, all of us here tonight on this floor and others—to try to get this urgent issue the attention it really requires here in the House of Representatives, but we know that, ultimately, most of Mr. RYAN's recommendations are more about rhetoric than reality.

My question in looking at his list of proposals is, first of all: Where is the jobs plan? We all know that the primary means and pathway out of poverty is a good-paying job with benefits.

Add to that that his proposal has, really, the same—I call it—old-time block granting proposals that we have seen, once again, for, I guess, 4 years in the Ryan budget. In fact, if you will recall, the Ryan Republican budget takes more than two-thirds of its cuts from programs that serve low-income and vulnerable Americans. When he talks about consolidating programs, including SNAP, into block grants, it is as if he is forgetting that his budget cuts \$300 billion in these 11 programs for the next 10 years. I can't quite figure out why the rhetoric in the plan lays this out, but yet his budget takes the same plan and cuts \$300 billion.

It does nothing, as I said, to create jobs. It does nothing to provide Americans a living wage or to extend unemployment insurance to the 3.3 million long-term unemployed. People really need to understand that this plan is not about substance. It is about Republicans trying to put a compassionate face on their draconian policies. That is what this is about.

Some of us have raised some key questions about this proposal, and I

would like to just lay out some of these questions when we are evaluating his plan. The House Ways and Means Committee, under the tremendous leadership of our ranking member, SANDY LEVIN, laid out some of these questions, which include:

Does compassionate conservatism really just mean cutting spending while saying you are about caring for the poor?

Will this plan include proposals that have been shown to both reward work and reduce poverty, such as increasing the minimum wage and extending benefits to the long-term unemployed who are looking for work?

Will Representative RYAN support flexible assistance to States to help struggling Americans or will he push States to cut such assistance?

Will Mr. RYAN's proposal fit into a balanced approach to address the deficit?

I just have to say, Mr. POCAN and others who are listening tonight, in this block granting proposal and in many of his proposals, there are work requirements. For any of the services or for any of the programs, you have to have a job. They have cut workforce training, and they have not created any jobs, so their work requirement as eligibility for programs that help provide this bridge over troubled waters just doesn't make any sense. It is wrong. Unless you have got a full-employment economy and unless the recession has really ensured that everyone has a good-paying job, then a work requirement to be eligible for benefits in order to help reduce poverty or to help lift you out of poverty is just counterproductive, and it doesn't make any sense. This is something that we have to continue to work on in terms of Mr. RYAN. We need this conversation. It needs to be bipartisan.

This week, some of us are taking the Live the Wage Challenge from the Raise the Wage coalition. We are living on \$77 a week, which is what a minimum wage employee in this country has to live on after taxes and housing expenses. We are doing this, though, to raise awareness of the everyday struggles of millions of our constituents. We will be off of this \$77-a-week budget in a week, but millions of our constituents won't be. I wish that this plan would really have a pathway so that millions of our constituents would be able to live off of a good-paying job with benefits.

Finally, let me just say that this Congress should focus on supporting and expanding programs that are working to lift people out of poverty—programs that have worked for the last 50 years since the war on poverty began—such as Head Start. I will tell you that we have got a long way to go. We shouldn't talk about cutting these programs. They have helped people move into the middle class. We know that. We should not play politics with poverty.

I hope the Republicans really get real about reducing poverty rather than

trying to fool the public, and that is what is happening now. They are trying to fool the public with this new brand, and it is a new brand of conservative compassion, but I will tell you that this rhetoric has nothing to do with the reality of the Ryan budget. This is where the rubber meets the road.

Thank you again for giving us the opportunity to talk about this.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative LEE.

Representative LEE and I and Representative MOORE all serve on the Budget Committee, and we have had a lot of time to see the PAUL RYAN Republican budget.

When you talk about the SNAP program, I will just give one example. I remember, in this body, we had a debate as to whether we were going to cut \$20 billion or eventually \$39 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. Yet we knew, when the Ryan budget was proposed—the Republican budget that was voted on in this body—the cuts to the SNAP program were \$135 billion. Either there has been a rebirth in how we look at poverty from the other side of the aisle or, perhaps, there is just a little different packaging of some of the same bad ideas that just sound a little better, and I really appreciate your bringing those out.

Ms. MOORE. Before you leave, I wanted to know if you would respond to a question, Ms. LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Yes.

Ms. MOORE. You mentioned in your remarks that, in the Budget Committee and on the budget that this House passed, there were 300—was it “billion” dollars in cuts?

Ms. LEE of California. It was \$300 billion by consolidating the 11 programs that he wants to block grant to the States.

Ms. MOORE. But what he says in his rollout is that this is budget neutral, which means that it won't cost taxpayers any more. It is budget neutral, and it won't cost taxpayers any more, but it also will not cut programs. It is a really clever sort of budgeting trick on one hand, don't you think, to say you are not going to cut it from where you have already cut it?

Ms. LEE of California. It is more than clever. I think it is wrong to mislead the public as it relates to the numbers. It is cooking the books. It is robbing Peter to pay Paul. It may be budget neutral, but, definitely, the cuts will take place in order to get to a budget neutral plan, and that is the problem I have with this. By consolidating all of these programs and by block-granting these programs, who is going to see the cuts and feel the cuts of the block granting? It is going to be the most vulnerable.

Thank you very much for raising that, but it is true. We see this on the Budget Committee each and every day.

Mr. POCAN. Representative LEE, if you would yield to one more question

since we are talking about the bad math that we all too often see from the other side of the aisle: Didn't we also, during the budget, see some incredibly bad math when it came to the budget's repealing the benefits of the Affordable Care Act but its somehow trying to keep the revenue in savings? Wasn't that bad math something like \$2 trillion worth of bad math, and now we are supposed to accept this \$300 billion, allegedly, "no cuts" to the program? What were those numbers?

Ms. LEE of California. It was very interesting. Of course, they have opposed the Affordable Care Act and have tried to repeal it—what?—50-some times now, but yet have captured the savings, which the Affordable Care Act is very clear on having made, to base their budget on those captured savings.

I think that, again, it is fuzzy math, and it is a way to deceive the public. It is a way to promote their policies of making sure that those who have access to affordable health care now don't have it in the future and that those who need it will be prevented from gaining it through the Affordable Care Act.

Ms. MOORE. I just want to ask you one more question about this fuzzy math, Congresswoman, since you serve on the Budget Committee.

The SNAP program is an entitlement program. What it means is, if you are eligible for food stamps, you receive them. Food stamps were critical in getting people over the hump in the recession. People sometimes reported that their only income was these food stamps.

So, if you see block grant SNAP—and correct me if I am wrong—what that means is that no matter how bad the economy becomes—because we have a countercyclical economy if we get a recession or a depression—and no matter how many people are eligible for food stamps, once you get your block grant, your some certain amount of money, and once that money runs out, then you will find yourself on a waiting list or not being served. Is that how you understand a "block grant"?

Ms. LEE of California. Exactly, Congresswoman MOORE. I am glad you raised that because that is exactly what happens.

First of all, there will be some requirements of the States but not many, and once the States run out of money, it is too bad. Food stamp recipients may or may not receive the type of assistance they need to help them with this as a bridge over troubled waters. It is not a fair system. We would see more people being cut from SNAP rolls, and we would also see more people needing food stamps because of the safety net being eroded even further. So it is a catch-23. Block-granting all of this to the States would harm the most vulnerable.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you.

Mr. POCAN. Again, thank you, Representative LEE. I appreciate it. Your final comments about how hard it is to

actually be able to eat a block grant, perhaps, is part of the problem of why we don't quite trust what we see in that it will work as presented. Thank you so much for your time.

I would like to yield to another colleague of mine who is also from the State of California. He is one of my fellow freshman colleagues, Representative MARK TAKANO.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Earlier today, your colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) released his long-awaited antipoverty plan. This is a bold step for Mr. RYAN because, if you look at the history of the Republican Party, there is a clear and undeniable pattern of implementing policies that help the top 2 percent but that do nothing for those struggling to make ends meet. Of course, they have proposed various "reforms" over the years, but those initiatives were never anything other than safety net cuts or ineffective, recycled ideas disguised as reform. I am thinking of a childhood jingle, "Jack and the Beanstalk"—Fee-fi-fo-fum. I smell the budget of faux reform.

□ 1900

That appears to be the case here.

Mr. RYAN calls his new plan an "Opportunity Grant," as it would consolidate safety net programs such as food stamps and housing vouchers into a single grant to States.

If that sounds familiar, that is because an "Opportunity Grant" is nothing more than block grants under a new name, and block grants have been shown to have limited impact in helping to lift people out of poverty.

Now, if Mr. RYAN really wanted to lift people out of poverty, he would support a raise in the minimum wage. Raising the minimum wage will increase the take-home pay for more than 28 million workers, add \$35 billion to the economy in higher wages through 2016, and create 85,000 new jobs as a result of increased economic opportunity.

At the very least, I know that my colleague, BARBARA LEE from California, is, as I am, undertaking the challenge to live on a minimum wage by living off of \$77, the average amount of money left over for full-time minimum wage workers after taxes and housing expenses.

I would challenge Mr. RYAN to step inside the shoes of someone who is living on that minimum wage. Although I know I could never fully understand what it is like, this challenge will give me a small glimpse into the lives of many people in my district.

So I would like to invite Mr. RYAN to participate in the challenge so he can, for a brief moment, understand what it is like for people in poverty to live on such a wage. Perhaps then Mr. RYAN will understand that the same old recycled ideas will not help those who really are in need.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative TAKANO, for all the work you are doing.

Mr. Speaker, next I would like to yield to a colleague of mine from the great State of Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a great friend of mine going back to the days in the State legislature, not only a great friend, but a great mentor to me.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you so much, Mr. POCAN. And I want to join my other colleagues for thanking you for your stewardship with the Progressive Caucus and putting this Special Order together.

I won't waste a lot of time complimenting our fellow Wisconsinite for at least listening to some of the ideas that have come from the Democratic side in his poverty plan. I think that looking at mandatory minimums is a long overdue sort of proposal that needs to get some traction.

Certainly, expanding the earned income tax credit for millions of Americans will make a true difference in many people's lives, and I just want to congratulate Mr. RYAN for that.

But let me be really clear. You don't have to really go through the entire 70 pages of his proposal because he starts right out in the beginning telling you that he doesn't believe that the safety net programs, that the efforts to help people get out of poverty for all these years, have been very helpful. He starts off by calling them a failure.

We all know that many of the programs created under FDR and President Lyndon Baines Johnson literally ended poverty among the elderly, for example. And we have seen poverty, as compared to what it would have been, cut at least by half because of Medicaid, because of Medicare, because of food stamps, because of other sorts of programs.

Yet, I guess Mr. RYAN believes that if you just keep saying it enough times, it will come true. We have heard Mr. RYAN lecture all of us, all over the country, about how the so-called entitlement programs are going to down our economy. He doesn't believe that the \$618 billion worth of corporate tax breaks that he passed last week is a detriment to our economy, but he has called for, on a consistent basis, for privatizing Social Security, for block-granting Medicaid—not in this particular plan.

In case people don't understand what block-granting is, just think chopping block. You give the States some certain amount of money, and when they run out, they just run out. You are no longer categorically eligible.

He has proposed voucherizing Medicare, giving seniors some certain amount of money. You do very well if all you need is a flu shot. But if you have a heart attack or a stroke, that is not going to go very far toward your health care.

He has consistently—and now, in this particular proposal, block-granting one of the great entitlement programs, the SNAP program, which worked beautifully in the last recession. We now see the food stamp rolls going down, as

the economy improves. And when the economy is bad, the food stamp rolls go up.

That did not happen with the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Act. It was not responsive to our countercyclical economy. So what that really means is that these block-granted programs were fixed, framed, and frozen, starting out with a \$300 billion cut. Eventually we will see that they will become totally inadequate toward ameliorating poverty, and we will see the poverty rolls creep up, and it will be particularly egregious on women and children.

Women and children: women, are disproportionately adversely impacted and benefit from these safety net programs. Food stamps: women disproportionately need food stamps, disproportionately use these programs.

The pay-fors, it is just egregious to say that we will provide the earned income tax credit and we will start by cutting programs like Meals on Wheels for the elderly and the food and nutrition programs for children.

Go right for the food, right at the bottom of the hierarchy of needs. Go right straight there and take food, literally, out of poor people's mouths in order to pay for the earned income tax credit expansion.

I wish we had sort of done that last week when we passed the \$618 billion of corporate welfare without a pay-for at all.

So I just say that this is yet another chapter in a book we have seen before. This is just another incarnation of an idea that there is some moral hazard to helping poor people, that you have got to restrict and limit how much you do for them, and that most of the money that is generated through our economy ought to be plowed back into helping corporations and not people.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative MOORE. You have been an advocate your entire life for those who are most needy, those trying to aspire to be in the middle class. Thank you for all that you do, and so articulately explaining the problems with PAUL RYAN's proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now yield to another colleague of mine, a colleague from the great State of Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who is the chair of our very important policy and steering committee, and a good friend and colleague of mine in the Progressive Caucus.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman. I can't thank you enough for the great work that you are doing and being such a leader on issues that focus on what this institution has, by way of offering opportunity for people. That is its mission. We know that.

I thank you for coming to the Congress for the right reasons, and for helping to try to make a difference in people's lives.

A rose is a rose is a rose. Once again, Chairman RYAN has come forward with what he and the Republican majority

purport to be a serious plan for addressing poverty in America. And once again, the centerpiece of his plan is the same old bad idea.

Chairman RYAN wants to dismantle all of the major Federal antipoverty programs that have long been proven to work for families in need. He wants to convert them into a block grant for the States. He now calls them Opportunity Grants.

That is a message. It sounds good. They are block grants, pure and simple. They put decisions in the hands of the States. They cut the funding, and they take all of the safeguards out and they fray the social safety net. That is what it is about. They have been consistent about this year after year after year.

I will just tell you about the food stamp program. Congressman POCAN, you were not here 17 years ago. I was, when the then-Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, said we need to block-grant the SNAP program, Medicaid, and a variety of other programs. It is the same failed policy over and over and over again.

Let me talk about food stamps for a second. Food stamps helped to lift 5 million Americans above the poverty line in 2012, 2.2 million of them children.

Every single dollar invested in food stamps generates \$1.79 in local economic activity. But what would Chairman RYAN do?

He would end food stamps, our Nation's most important antihunger initiative, in favor of a block grant, just like he would end the low-income energy assistance program, LIHEAP, child care fund, weatherization assistance, public housing, temporary assistance for needy families, community development grants, and dislocated worker grants.

If you read his report, it is almost diabolical in the sense that the language that is used, and it is language, and it is a message, and it does nothing to provide opportunity or to help the poor in this country.

There are some good parts of his antipoverty plan. Expanding the EITC for childless workers. But even that issue is infected with bad ideas.

To pay for this EITC expansion already introduced by the Democratic Party, Mr. RYAN would end programs like the social services block grant, which helps roughly 23 million Americans, half of them children, with child care assistance, child abuse prevention, and community-based care for seniors and disabled persons.

He also wants to end the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program, which—it is madness—which reaches over 115,000 students in 14 States with healthy foods. And then he will decry people who are on food stamps and say they are selecting the wrong foods for their families, when he will just cut the Fresh Fruits and Vegetable Program.

What have we come to here?

What is this harshness that has come over our public policy, that mean-spir-

itedness that has come over our public policy?

For over a year now, Chairman RYAN has tried to pretend that he wants to put forth serious proposals to alleviate poverty in America. But the proof is in the pudding.

Look at his most recently proposed budget. Two-thirds of the cut in that budget fall on low and middle-income families. It tries to turn Medicare into an underfunded voucher program, shreds our social safety net, block-grants food stamps and Medicaid, slashes the WIC program, that is Women, Infants and Children, by \$595 million.

It cuts spending that we do every year on health issues, on worker training, on education. He tries to cut that program by \$791 billion over the next 10 years.

It slashes the child care assistance program, as I said, job training program, Pell grants, and medical research.

I am a cancer survivor. I am alive because of the grace of God and biomedical research. Why shouldn't other people have the advantage of biomedical research?

Why would he want to cut that?

And he does this all while cutting taxes for the wealthiest.

□ 1915

I am glad to see that Chairman RYAN at least recognizes that he and his party need to be doing more to help end poverty and hunger in our Nation, and I hope we can engage in a constructive dialogue on issues like the EITC expansion and sentencing reform.

If Chairman RYAN and the Republican majority want to get serious about helping families in need, they can start tomorrow. They need to make sure that their Republican child tax credit bill—so generous to those who can afford it—that they need to make sure that that helps low-income kids as well.

That child tax credit program will cut the child tax credit for 450,000 veterans. What are our veterans doing? They are serving. They are sacrificing themselves and their families, and he wants to cut their child tax credit. That is what is in there.

Then he talks about the deserving poor and the undeserving poor. Let me ask Chairman RYAN: What about low-income kids? What about them? What about the infants and toddlers? Tell us, Mr. Chairman, who are the "deserving" infants and toddlers? Who are the "undeserving" infants and toddlers? We need an answer to our question.

Our colleagues could join us in raising the minimum wage, something that is long overdue, but until then, actions speak louder than words.

The bulk of this new plan, I am afraid, is the same old snake oil, the same tired, discredited, ideological attacks on the social safety net that Chairman RYAN and this majority have been putting forward time and again

since coming to power in 2010. It will not wash. It is harsh. It is cruel, and it is mean-spirited.

That is not why we came to this institution, Mr. POCAN. It is not why you came. It is not why I came. It was the hope and the dream and the opportunity to provide opportunity for the people of this Nation, to make this institution do what our Founding Fathers thought it should do and to give people a chance.

This Expanding Opportunity in America will take away people's opportunities, and the American public knows it.

Thank you for what you are doing. It is an honor to work with you and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), Congressman RYAN of Ohio, and our other colleagues who stood on this floor tonight to decry this shame of a document.

Mr. POCAN. Again, thank you so much, Representative DELAURO, for your many years of service to this body and to the people of the country and fighting for those who need help the most.

I now would like to yield to another colleague of mine, but I am not going to say "Representative RYAN" because that might be confusing, given the conversation we are having, but let's say maybe the Budget Committee's other Representative RYAN, the Democratic Representative RYAN from the State of Ohio.

So I yield to another Budget Committee member, Representative TIM RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

My office does get a lot of phone calls against this budget, but they are not realizing that I am supporting them against the Paul Ryan budget. I think these reforms—and I was able to come a little bit earlier and listen to some of my colleagues talk about what is in this document that is supposed to be a new idea, a new way, a new approach—and while I commend Chairman RYAN for trying to come up with some new ideas, I am all about innovation. I am all about a new approach.

I think the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) hit the nail on the head when she was talking about the fruits and vegetables and the healthy food.

If we are going to move forward as a country, if we want to make sure we take care of the issue of half the country in the next 10 years is going to either have diabetes or prediabetes—and it is going to drive up Medicaid costs, it is going to drive up Medicare costs, it is going to drive up private insurance—one of the issues we need to focus on is how do we get more money into programs that are going to make sure young kids have access to fresh foods, period.

We don't need to get really complicated. We don't need to come up with any new grand scheme. We have already got it. It is already in there,

and Chairman RYAN is taking it out, deinvesting in the very things that are going to drive down health care costs, make kids better able to learn and focus and concentrate on the classroom, so they are not having a Fruit Roll-Up and think that it is fruit. They are having fruits and vegetables and access to food over the weekends and all of these things.

I find it extremely interesting that a majority of the cuts that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) proposed to reduce poverty—and in his budgets, two-thirds of the savings in the FY15 Republican budget came from programs that serve these populations, including moving millions out of the SNAP program.

So a new approach is great, innovation is fantastic, but we know what we need to do, and it starts with diet. It starts with wellness. It starts with some of these other things that are going to allow that person who may be living in poverty to be as strong and capable, as healthy as they possibly can, so they can work themselves out of poverty.

Nobody here is defending the status quo—oh, great, people are accessing public funds or public programs—we want to get people on a ladder out of poverty. That is what America should be all about, but we are failing miserably, and this program and the cuts that Chairman RYAN is talking about are going to make it worse.

I think we rank 10th or 11th in people coming up from poverty, lower socioeconomic status, and finally making their way to the middle class. We rank down from other countries—Nordic countries and the rest.

I want to thank the gentleman for doing this. I think this is an amazing opportunity for us to provide some contrast to what Chairman RYAN has proposed, but let me say I think one of the most direct benefits for the war on poverty is an increase in the minimum wage, and today—ironically enough—is the 5-year anniversary since the minimum wage has been increased.

Some States are higher than the \$7.25 Federal minimum wage. In Ohio, it is \$7.95 and is indexed for inflation, which is better, but it is not anywhere near where we need to be.

I wanted to come and talk for a couple of minutes about what we need to do and what the benefits would be, and I know we normally hear from somebody who is going to say this is going to cost jobs, this is going to slow down economic growth and all the rest, and I will share with them a study that just came out from Labor that said that the 13 States that increased the minimum wage this year had some increase—whether indexed for inflation or through legislation—saw an increase in the minimum wage, had more rapid job growth than all of the other States.

For those people who don't understand how that could be—because we hear so much rhetoric: this is going to cost jobs, this is going to cost jobs—if

the average family has more money in their pocket to go out and buy things, that is good for the economy.

Imagine if the Walgreens and the Sam's Clubs and all the rest had a higher minimum wage, if those folks were making an extra couple bucks an hour—and it doesn't have to happen tomorrow. We can do it and stage it over the course of the next few years to make sure it doesn't have a dramatic impact on business—but if all of those folks made an extra \$16 or \$20 a day, an extra \$100 a week, an extra \$200 every two weeks of pay, an extra \$400 a month, that is a lot of money.

That is enough to go out and get a Chevy Cruze made in Lordstown, Ohio, and pay the insurance and the rest on that. What does that do for the economy if the 1.5 million people in the country—the 62,000 people in my congressional district who make the minimum wage go out and have a little bit of extra money? That is how you are going to move the economy.

Maybe we could get rid of some of these programs because that family will have access to the food because they will have a little bit more money in their pockets, so they will be able to afford the fruits and vegetables and the kinds of food they need to stay healthy, prevent disease, and be able to concentrate and focus in the classroom.

I just want to make two last points. The first is zero increase in the minimum wage, and if you are in the private sector, you have seen a 10 percent increase in earnings, just 10 percent over the past 4 or 5 years since 2009. If you want to go out and get apples, 16 percent increase—bacon has gone up 67 percent; cheddar cheese, 20 percent; milk, 20 percent; eggs, 30 percent; gas, there has been a 44.5 percent increase in gas since 2009.

Now, if you are making minimum wage and all of these costs are going up—for eggs and milk and gas and bacon and coffee, coffee went up 27 percent, the kinds of things that are basic staples to the American diet—how are you going to keep up? How are you going to say, oh, I want to send my kid to a basketball camp in the summer or maybe an afterschool program or I need a baby sitter or I need to catch a cab? You don't have any extra money. You just don't.

I think it is essential for us, if we are going to close the income inequality gap between the wealthiest in our country and the poorest in our country, if we are going to close that, if we want people to work hard and play by the rules and then benefit, this is something that is very simple.

We get a lot of rhetoric. We heard it in the last Presidential election: 47 percent of the country are takers, they want to be on the dole, they don't want to work.

Then we have something that is going to benefit the people who are working, doing the jobs that many Americans don't want to do, cleaning

the hotel rooms, working at the gas station, the wear and tear on their bodies over the years, the long hours, swing shifts, and the whole lot. This increase will not just benefit minimum wage workers. It is going to go up and benefit everybody.

The last point—I promise—we need minimum wage workers who are out there to be organized. We didn't always have a 40-hour workweek. We didn't always get time-and-a-half over 40 hours. We didn't always have a 5-day workweek. We didn't have a National Labor Relations Act. We didn't have Social Security. We didn't have Medicare.

These were things that came about because average people got organized, and they said enough is enough. We are not going to have our senior citizens work until they die. We are not going to have our senior citizens not have health care. We are not going to have people working in unsafe factories—and you are going to work 40 hours a week.

From our side, we expect people to go out and work and work their butts off to get ahead. Our job is to stay organized, to make sure that policies are in place that are both good for the economy and good for families in the United States.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) for the opportunity to come here and share just briefly. I look forward to working with you. Hopefully, we can get a vote on the House floor sometime soon. I don't think we will. I am not really optimistic about it, but I hope that we can organize over the next few months and years to make this a reality for all of those families in the United States.

Mr. POCAN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio, Representative RYAN, for all you have done in your relentless fight on behalf of the workers in your district, and thank you so much, again, for being here today.

Finally, I would like to yield to a colleague of mine—another freshman colleague of mine from the great State of New York, Representative HAKEEM JEFFRIES.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from the Badger State, for yielding to me, as well as for the tremendous leadership that you continue to exhibit week after week in leading the Congressional Progressive Caucus' Special Order hour, championing issues important to working families and the poor and the sick and the afflicted, those who need our government to be more compassionate, giving them the assistance they need in order to pursue the American Dream.

I appreciate that advocacy, and I appreciate this opportunity to speak briefly on the plan presented by Chairman PAUL RYAN, Expanding Opportunity in America.

I would like to believe that that is the objective, and I certainly am of the view that the chairman is acting in good faith, as it relates to his willing-

ness to try to tackle the issue of poverty in America, but if you put it all in the context of the Ryan budget that has come to the floor of the House of Representatives year after year after year since the Republicans claimed the majority, which passed with overwhelming support from their caucus, the question is: Is their real interest in expanding opportunity in America, or is the fundamental objective really to expand inequality in America?

□ 1930

What PAUL RYAN are we talking to in attempting to have this conversation? Is it the Chairman RYAN whose budget cut \$125 billion in supplemental nutrition assistance in a country where 50 million people are food insecure, 18 million of those individuals children? We can't have a real conversation about opportunity if that is still the position of Chairman RYAN, his Budget Committee, and the majority.

Are we having a conversation with a chairman whose budget cut \$260 billion in higher education funding, threatening to rob young Americans from their pursuit of their dream of obtaining a college education and being all that they can be in America? We can't have a real conversation about opportunity with individuals who want to cut \$260 billion in higher education spending.

I want to believe that we can proceed in good faith and try and tackle this issue. But are we entering into a discussion with the same group of individuals, the chairman whose budget cut \$732 billion in Medicaid, a program designed to benefit, in significant numbers, poor, elderly, and disabled individuals? That is not expanding opportunity in America. That is expanding inequality in America.

Certainly, there are some proposals contained in the document that was unveiled today that we can embrace and have a meaningful discussion about in trying to arrive at common ground—sentencing reform as well as the notion of expanding the earned income tax credit. But there is no minimum wage enhancement. There is no infrastructure investment. There is no unemployment compensation insurance renewal. There is no equal pay for equal work, and there is no real effort to deal with the issues that we are prepared to work on to solve the problem of poverty for millions of Americans. For that reason, I am skeptical that this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative JEFFRIES. I, too, am skeptical. Having served on the Budget Committee with you, we have seen two different PAUL RYANS. We are hoping that maybe this is a reformed PAUL RYAN, but we are also fearful this is just a repackaged PAUL RYAN. So thank you so much.

Finally, I would like to yield to a colleague from the Progressive Caucus from the great State of Texas, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I can't thank you enough for leading this Special Order. Again, the passion that you have shown in your service here in the United States Congress really speaks to what Americans send their representatives to the Congress for, to be problem solvers.

I am going to use the word "pray." I pray that there is a reformed Chairman RYAN, Congressman RYAN, because I have come from my district, you go to your district, and we see the pain. I see the pain of those who have not been able to secure an unemployment insurance extension. I live with the value of the earned income tax credit. I am going to spend a little time on that.

My son, some many years ago as a young man, volunteered with the HOPE Project. He went to New Orleans right after Hurricane Katrina and was able to work with the victims—the survivors, they like to be called, and they were—of Hurricane Katrina in applying for their earned income tax credit. It was a lifeline for people who had worked.

So I just want to end on this note by thanking you, by saying that there are people who are waiting for the Congress to act, to pass the earned income tax credit, raise the minimum wage, extend unemployment insurance, pass the middle class package of the Democrats, and work on behalf of the American people.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative JACKSON LEE, and I yield back the balance of my time.

BILLS LANGUISHING IN THE SENATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time and appreciate being here on behalf of my colleagues and to have a discussion that is going to focus on what we are doing with our time.

Mr. Speaker, it seems like it never fails. When we are out and about in our districts talking with our constituents, people will approach us, and they want to talk about how concerned they are about the cost of living and what they see happening to the price at the pump and to the price at the grocery store. They want to talk about how concerned they are with how much more education seems to cost them. They are concerned about our national security. They are concerned about the border security. They are concerned about their retirement security. The list goes on and on and on.

They will look at us and, Mr. Speaker, without fail, they will say: Tell me exactly what you are doing about this. I want to know what you are doing to address this problem or that problem

or any of the issues that all of us hard-working families are out there facing every single day—every day.

What they are looking for is solutions. What we have realized is that many times they don't know exactly how hard we are working here in the House and that the obstruction that is happening is not necessarily here in the House. What is happening is across the dome over on the Senate side.

Now, I have got in front of me 300 of the 332 bills that have passed this House—300 of the 332 bills that have passed this House. Now, sometimes people will say: Where are those bills sitting? Why haven't they gone to the President's desk?

Well, I always like to tell them, they are on the desk of HARRY REID. It is unfortunate, but it is where those 332 bills are languishing.

Now, as we begin to look at being out of D.C. and working in our districts for August, one would think that the majority leader over in the Senate, Mr. REID, would get busy with trying to clean his desk. Most people do that. When they expect to be out of town working for a few weeks, they try to get their desk cleaned off, and they try to get things pushed out to where they need to go. They get things organized. They get things done. But that is not what we are seeing in the Senate.

I had one of my constituents come up to me one day and say: Look, I am all for the Larry the Cable Guy approach.

I said: Tell me what that is.

They said: Git-R-Done.

That is what people are looking for, getting the job done on behalf of hard-working taxpayers.

Now, sometimes people will say: Tell me what all is in this list of things that you have done.

Let me just go through what we have found in our bills that have been passed. 178 of these 332 bills, 178 of the bills passed with no opposition, none at all. There was agreement, total agreement, on these bills.

One would think that the Senate majority leader would say: 178 bills in which there is complete agreement, those bills coming out of the House? Surely we can move those forward in the Senate. Surely, out of 100, we can get 60 to agree on something.

But it is amazing. The Senator still has not called for a vote on those.

Beyond that, 54 more bills passed under suspension. That means you had to have two-thirds of this body agree. So all totaled, that is 232 of the 332 bills that have passed this body with either no opposition or two-thirds of the body voting in support of that.

I also find it very interesting, and probably some of our Democrat colleagues would like to join us in our Special Order tonight, because 55 of these bills—55 of these bills—were authored by Democrats. I am certain that they would like to see the majority leader take up their bills and push them through.

Mr. Speaker, when you are so far behind in your work, you generally work

nights and you work weekends. You roll up your sleeves, you buckle down, and you get the job done. But that is not what we are seeing happen coming from the Senate. What we are continuing to see is a resistance, an absolute resistance, to moving forward and taking up these bills.

Now, as we go into our last week next week before our August work period, there are several issues that we would love to see the Senate address. As I said, the issues that are stacked in front of us cover everything that the American people are talking to us about, that our constituents are talking to us about when we go into our town halls.

On the issue of energy, we have 16 bills that deal with the issues of energy, 16 different bills that are right here that would address energy issues. Many people have heard us talk about the Keystone pipeline. Do you realize that the bill that would address the Keystone pipeline approval you are going to find right here in this hefty stack of paper?

For those who are just really concerned about what they are paying at the pump—and I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but I have been watching the price of a gallon of gas when I fill up my car, and in the last few months, I have gone from \$3.59 to as high as \$4.15 to fill that car up—far too much. For people who are paying too much at the pump, there is legislation in here that would get the cost down. It is Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America that Works, getting that price down at the pump.

For individuals that feel like we are paying too much on our electricity rates—and we have all watched these rates go up. You look at that bill every month and you see, compared to last year, you are using fewer kilowatt hours but you are paying more. And you think, how could this be? Well, of course, we all remember the President saying that the prices would necessarily skyrocket under him, and he has made good on that promise. Maybe a lot of promises he hasn't made good on, but, the fact that gas was going to cost us more and electricity was going to cost us more, he is making good on that.

Well, here is a bill, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act. All of these are cost-of-living items that we look at in our monthly budgets, energy being one of those that affects us all, everywhere we drive, when we turn on the lights, when we light the fireplace or turn on the burner of the stove to cook lunch. Bills that address those issues, they are found right in front of us.

So there is plenty of work on HARRY REID's desk. HARRY REID has been unwilling to call the vote. I know that my colleagues join me in saying we would love to see him call the vote on one of these 332 bills.

At this time, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mrs. BLACKBURN for the wonderful leadership that she is providing on this bill this evening.

It really is quite shocking. We have had a conversation this week about all the work that has been done in this Chamber. We have worked really hard. We have been here late at night, and we have been here every day because we know people across the United States are suffering. They are suffering in this economy, as Mrs. BLACKBURN has said. They are suffering from the rising gas prices. They are rising because of joblessness. They are very worried because their children aren't getting jobs. Most particular, the African American youth, it is out of control the number of African American youth who don't have employment, and in the Latino community, as well.

We are heartbroken about that because this is hurting families across the United States, so therefore we have been here doing the work. We have been here passing jobs bill after jobs bill. And this week we learned, as Mrs. BLACKBURN rightly said, that we passed 332 bills out of this Chamber.

Now, we didn't fully expect when we passed these bills that every word and every jot and every tittle of every bill would be immediately unanimously agreed to by the Senate.

□ 1945

We didn't kid ourselves, but we thought at least let's get started and do the work; 332 bills, and out of those HARRY REID couldn't find one that he could pick up and we could have a conversation about and pass and do something to move this economy forward? The economy is one thing, Mr. Speaker, it is also all of the firefights around the world that are happening. We are concerned about America's national security issues. We are concerned about our allies, like Israel, and what is happening in these countries.

We have bill after bill, scores of bills to address getting our Nation back in order. We want to work with the President. We want to work with the Democrat-controlled United States Senate and with HARRY REID, and what doesn't make one bit of sense to me, Mr. Speaker, when we have all these scandals, whether it is the VA or the IRS that is using the power of the Federal Government to punish innocent American citizens for simply expressing their political beliefs, all of these scandals, and we can't even get the attention of the U.S. Senate?

We have heard about a do-nothing Congress. I think we have to be a little more specific. It is a do-nothing U.S. Senate. There is a distinction here. There is no equivalency. So I wanted to come down to the floor when I heard Mrs. BLACKBURN speaking this evening, I wanted to come to the floor because she is exactly right. I know that many of our colleagues on the floor today agreed with the position Mrs. BLACKBURN is putting forward this evening.

Many of our colleagues wanted to be here because they want to work, and have worked, and now we are saying to HARRY REID with one voice, please come back, we are happy to work with you. There is plenty of time. If you want to come back in August, we will be here. Whatever it takes, we are here to work on behalf of the American people. Why not come and join us?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentlelady.

She mentioned jobs bills. Mr. Speaker, 40 of the bills sitting in this stack are related to jobs. Just the Keystone pipeline bill, there are 42,000 direct and indirect jobs that are related to getting the Keystone pipeline started. So the question becomes: What are you afraid of? What do you fear from taking up some of these bills? Do you fear the American people going to work? Do you fear that things just might get on the right track? That you would find in these 332 bills that we expand some opportunities and the environment for opportunities and the environment for jobs growth to take place? Why is it that the Senate is content with being a do-nothing Senate? Why is it that they are accepting of being a do-nothing Senate? I think we would all like to know the answer to that question. Do they like it? Do they like that they have a stack of work this high sitting on their desk that they are just not able to get around to?

You know, I used to do some door-to-door sales, and we had a little wooden coin and it was called "a round to-it." Any time we felt like procrastinating, any time we felt like we just didn't have the energy to do the heavy lift or make one more sales call or go to another prospect, we would take that round to-it out of our pocket and look at it and remind ourselves, the important thing is to get around to doing the job in front of you.

You know what, Mr. Speaker, I still have my round to-it. I have it on my desk. It is getting old and worn-out, but anytime you think I could just be lazy, I could just not finish this and go do something I want to do, you look at the work in front of you, you look at the fact that you have a cluttered desk, and you look at the fact and consider that people are counting on you to do your job, and you make it a priority to get around to it and to get the job done. That is precisely what the American people have expected of this body, and we have done it. We have done that. And it is frustrating to us and to the American people, and I tell you, we join them in their frustration because look at this, all of these bills, and nothing has been done.

The gentlewoman from Minnesota mentioned the issue of veterans. Do you think it would be considered appropriate to not solve the VA issues and the issues for our Nation's veterans? Of course not.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. There is a heart-breaking story that happened to me

this week. I was on the plane, the usual Delta flight that I take out of Minneapolis at 1 p.m. on Monday afternoon when we come back to resume our work here, and a veteran came up to me, a young man who couldn't have been more than 30 years of age. He told me that he had been deployed in the Iraq war. While there, his knee had been shattered in a combat operation in service to his country. He told me that he has been waiting for over 1 year to get an appointment with the VA to go in to have the surgery done to fix his knee with arthroscopy. He called the VA center in Minneapolis to try and get in, and it has been over a year for a young man of maybe 30 years of age, and he can't get in and get his knee taken care of. I think that begs our involvement.

He wasn't even from my district, but I took his name and his address. I took all of his information, and then I took his hand, most importantly. I held his hand in mine and I looked into his eyes and I called him by his name and I said: I promise you I will personally call the VA center and make sure that you get a call back and that you get the appointment you need. And I will make sure that your Member of Congress gets this information and is able to help you because there is not one Member of Congress that I can imagine who wouldn't want to see a veteran get the help he has earned and that he deserves and that he needs. Anyone I believe in this House Chamber would do it, Republican or Democrat, this is not partisan.

But what absolutely floors me, Mr. Speaker, and I think floors Mrs. BLACKBURN, is that we want to help these veterans. How could anyone on the Senate side, anyone, possibly refuse reform of the VA?

Mr. Speaker, I understand and I am sure that Mrs. BLACKBURN is aware that today there was supposed to be a conference committee hearing on the VA reform bill and the Democrats in the Senate chose not to even show up to conference the bill.

Now, how in the world is this young man who is a veteran who served his country honorably supposed to expect that his government cares about him when the Senate won't even show up to talk about VA reform?

That is why I am so proud of the fact that Mrs. BLACKBURN has the physical stack of the work that this body has done, work to help veterans like this young, 30-year-old Iraq veteran. Or the moms that are waiting tables tonight and the dads who are at T-ball games tonight who are asking us, Could you please get the Keystone pipeline bill? Could you please do something about the Tax Code so my business can get up and fly?

That is why we are here tonight, not expecting that the Senate would agree with everything that is in these papers. We do not expect that for a minute. All we are saying is show up to your job, show up and work. We want to talk. We

are here. The President is very happy to talk to the terrorist nation of Iran. He has been very willing to negotiate, even to offer them a deal on developing a nuclear weapon, but for some reason, they won't talk to Republicans in the House of Representatives.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, on the veterans issue, there are three bills specifically that cover exactly what Mrs. BACHMANN has just mentioned. H.R. 4031, which is the Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act, this is something desperately needed. Accountability in the VA, absolutely. Why will the Senate not take this up? Why will they not come to work on this bill?

Another, H.R. 2072, Demanding Accountability For Veterans Act, again languishing on the desk of HARRY REID. Of course the VA should be accountable to the veterans and to the American taxpayer. Why are they not moving this forward so that it gets addressed?

H.R. 4810, Veteran Access to Care, precisely what Mrs. BACHMANN is speaking of, making certain that the veterans are guaranteed that they are seen in a timely manner.

I have one constituent who got on the VA list for a primary physician 15 years ago. Guess what? He is still waiting. I have another constituent who has been on the list for 3 years and has never gotten a call.

This is completely unacceptable, and in this stack of 332 bills, you are going to find bills that will put that accountability in place. Mrs. BACHMANN mentioned also the issue of taxes. We hear about it everywhere we go. People are overtaxed. They are overworked. They realize that they are taxed far too much, and they are tired of it. They want to see the tax rates lowered and the tax burden lowered as well as seeing the regulatory burden lowered.

And on taxes, we have got seven bills, one we passed today, the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act. We have got permanent Internet tax freedom. It is right here, seven bills that deal with taxes. We also have H.R. 4457, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act. Hardworking men and women, small business owners, small business employees, they all want to make certain that we deal with this complicated and overbearing Tax Code. They want to make certain that we are reducing that burden on them.

We could take some steps, not solve all of the problems, but take some steps in that direction if the Senate would show up and take up some of the tax bills that are here and help us lower that burden.

We hear a lot about government spending. You know, government never gets enough of the taxpayers' money and government spends too much. You give them a little, they are going to take a little more. We have 31 different bills that are in this stack that deal with reining in government spending, that deal with some of the budget reforms that are desperately needed so

that we get rid of some antiquated processes and move to a new template for how we need to approach our spending and approach being a good steward of the taxpayers' money; 31 different bills. Pick one. Get going.

It is amazing, once you get going on a task, it is easier. You get momentum, and that is something that we would like to see the Senate get and take up some of these 332 bills that are sitting over on HARRY REID's desk.

Maybe you are aggravated about government waste and you are frustrated with regulatory overreach, and you would like to see a smaller Federal Government, and you would like it if some of these Federal agencies would stop wasting your money.

Well, we have 16 bills in this stack that deal with stopping that overreach and curbing that waste and putting the bureaucracy on the track to being a better steward of the taxpayer money. We have to remember it is not Federal Government money, it is not the money of this Chamber, it is the taxpayers' money. They want these issues addressed.

How about reining in red tape? You know, I talk to lots of small business manufacturers on a regular basis and they will say to me, the red tape is killing us. The regulation and the red tape is just killing us. We spend too much time on compliance. We have four different bills in here that deal with compliance and cutting red tape. That is another way that government can do a better job of responding to the needs of the American people and the taxpayers.

I think everybody, Mr. Speaker, is concerned about national security.

□ 2000

Every time you pick up a paper or you flip on a channel or you turn a page on your iPad and go to a Web site and look at what is happening, whether it is in Ukraine, the belligerence of Russia, whether it is what is happening in the Middle East, and what we see happening in Israel, concerns about Iran, everybody is concerned about foreign affairs and concerned about our Nation's security.

We have six different bills that would deal with these issues of national security. We would appreciate it if the Senate would take up some of these House-passed bills. Again, Mr. Speaker, 178 of these bills—178 of 332 bills have come out of this Chamber with no opposition at all.

Another 54 have passed, 54 have passed, with a two-thirds vote of this Chamber. As I said earlier, that is 232 of the 332 bills. By the way, 55 of the bills out of the 332 bills are bills that have been authored by the Democrats, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about repealing and replacing ObamaCare and making the health care system work, getting it into a healthy, healthy place, so that you are going to see people actually have access to health care.

Right now, we have got a situation where everybody's health insurance costs are going up, and they are concerned about that. Access with these very narrow networks is becoming more difficult. We are hearing of people that are having to travel great distances to get to physicians or they are having longer waits.

We found 11 bills right here that deal with health care. Some of these are repealing and replacing ObamaCare, 11 bills right here that could be taken up that would help with those situations, that would help with the access to health care, access to the doctor.

What we have seen happen with ObamaCare is that people have access to the queue because they have got a health care card, but what they do not have is access to the physician.

By the way, education—I talked to a constituent at the grocery store on Saturday morning, and she said that she was beginning to plan toward back to school for her two children. I said: Oh my goodness, it seems so early to be planning for back to school.

She said: Well, you know, they are going to be starting back to school the end of the first week of August and then into school the second week of August, and there are fees to pay, there are different class fees that have to be paid, sports teams that have to be signed up for, sports physicals that the children have to get, and those beginning-of-school expenses.

So she was beginning to focus on education and asked what were we going to do about letting parents and local school districts and getting rid of common core and replacing it with commonsense and putting parents and teachers in charge of those classrooms.

Well, we could make some progress in that direction. Seven of the bills that we have right here deal with education and with the issues that face parents and students and teachers. We are all concerned about the future and what is going to be there for our children, in making certain that they are prepared for the future and having access to a quality education and having that right there in our neighborhoods and our communities.

We could take some steps in that direction if the Senate would begin to take up some of the legislation that is over there on the Senate desk. As was said earlier, we are facing a do-nothing Senate because they have chosen not to get to work on this stack of legislation that would address some of these issues.

Mr. Speaker, this week, as we have looked at the crisis on the southern border, we have heard quite a bit of talk and conversation about the issues of human trafficking, drug trafficking, the sex trafficking that is taking place in this country.

Many people probably are not aware, and many of our colleagues probably haven't thought about the amount of work that we have done over the past 2 years on this issue, getting ready to

address the issue, doing some research and some digging and some education and addressing human trafficking, taking steps to prevent this, to have the ability to do some intervention, penalties, and making certain that we are strengthening the family unit and fighting these trafficking elements.

We have 11 bills specific to human trafficking that are right here, 11 bills that would help hold accountable some of the traffickers and smugglers and put penalties in place, strengthen and shore up families, take care of victims, do some work on prevention. It would be encouraging if the Senate would join us and address those.

There are other bills that are here. We have got bills that deal with innovation. We have got flexibility for working families to make it easier for working moms. All of those issues are issues that could be addressed.

Yes, we have worked in a bipartisan manner. Indeed, we recently—just a few minutes ago, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE was here on the floor talking about some of her work. I thought it was interesting. There was a report earlier in the week. She had had 18 rollcall votes on her amendments in the House in the past year. That is more rollcall votes than all the Republicans in the Senate combined.

She was asked about the amendments in a recent interview, and she said, "I want to thank the Republicans for their generosity."

That is the manner in which we have approached our job. As I said, 178 of the 332 bills that you are going to find in this stack, unanimous votes. You have got another 54 bills that are in this stack that had two-thirds majority support.

I thought it was also interesting, in the same article, Senator MANCHIN has not received a rollcall vote on an amendment since June of 2013. He had recently aired his frustration. He said, "I've never been in a less productive time in my life than I am right now in the United States Senate."

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that there are many people that probably share that thought over in the Senate because they are looking at the fact that things are not getting done in the Senate. Ninety-eight percent of these 332 bills have passed with support from both Democrats and Republicans.

If we were in school, that would be making an A grade on bipartisan support for legislation that is coming out of this House. Our committee chairmen have worked hard to be able to do that, and we have, in good faith, passed these bills, and in good faith, we have moved these bills to the Senate.

Right now, we are watching these bills sit on HARRY REID's desk. For whatever reason, he is choosing not to take these bills up.

At this time, I would like to yield some time to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her leadership on this important issue of this do-nothing Senate.

The President likes to refer to us as the do-nothing Congress. Well, tonight, we are presenting 332 reasons why it is actually the do-nothing Senate, as seen by the stack of the bills here on the gentlewoman's desk. This has made it the least productive Congress in history.

332 bills have passed the House and are sitting on HARRY REID's desk. These are not just Republican bills. 178 of these bills passed the House with no opposition at all. In fact, nearly 70 percent of these bills passed with two-thirds support or more. Fifty-five of these House bills were introduced by Democrats—still, HARRY REID refuses to bring these bills up for a vote.

While House Republicans are focused on building up America's middle class, the Senate Democrats are content to let dust gather on hundreds of bills that would grow the economy, reduce the size and scope of an overbearing Federal Government and, importantly, help create jobs in America.

Take the Keystone XL pipeline, for example. This is truly one of those shovel-ready projects that would create more than 42,000 direct and indirect jobs nationwide. Across the political spectrum, there is overwhelmingly support for this project, yet HARRY REID refuses to bring it up for a vote. I have got that bill right here. It is H.R. 3. This is a bill that we passed with bipartisan support, yet HARRY REID refuses to bring it up for a vote.

The Keystone pipeline enters Montana. It is the first State that the pipeline enters after it comes to us from Canada.

I was out in eastern Montana recently, and I was meeting with the NorVal Electric Co-Op. This is a small co-op in Montana that provides electricity to a few thousand Montana families. They told me that if the Keystone pipeline is approved, they will be able to keep electric rates for these Montana families flat for the next 10 years.

If the Keystone pipeline is not approved, the electric rates for these Montana families will go up about 40 percent over the course of the next 10 years because this co-op supplies electricity to one of the pump stations on the Keystone pipeline, and that extra volume will lower the rates for all users.

Sometimes, I wish the President would get out of the White House and come to a place like Montana and talk to those families and have him explain to them why he continues to block the Keystone pipeline. I would like HARRY REID to come out to Montana and explain to these Montana families why the Senate refuses to take up a vote and approve the Keystone pipeline.

The House, we are going to continue enacting solutions to help create jobs and build a healthy economy because that leads to greater freedom and opportunity. We are not going to stop doing our job simply because Senator Majority Leader HARRY REID has stopped doing his. It is time for the Senate to get back to work.

It is interesting, it has been quoted here tonight that SHEILA JACKSON LEE, the Democratic congresswoman, who we serve with here in the House, has had 18 rollcall votes on her amendments in the House in the past year.

That is more than all the Republicans in the Senate combined. When asked about those amendments in a recent interview, she said, "I want to thank the Republicans for their generosity."

It is time for the Senate to act. The Obama recovery, economic recovery, is 5 years old, and what have we seen? We shared this week the share of adults who are working is back to 1984 levels.

That is the year I graduated from Montana State University, with a degree in engineering. Far more adults have left the workforce than have found new jobs, and it has been said this is the worst recovery ever for long-term employed Americans.

The House has passed dozens of bills to create good-paying jobs and build a healthy economy, bills like the America's Small Business Tax Relief Act, which would lower costs for small businesses to allow them to hire more workers; or the Veterans Economic Opportunity Act, which improves programs that promote economic opportunity and ensures our Nation's vets have the tools and resources they need to find jobs they deserve.

Let me conclude by saying this: it is a shame that HARRY REID and the Senate Democrats won't take up more of these 40-plus bills of these over 300 bills that we have passed that will get our economy moving because it is clear that the President's policies aren't working.

House Republicans have a plan to get America back to work and get our economy moving in the right direction once again.

Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID, he doesn't have to agree with our ideas. That is the nature of democracy. That is the nature of having the Senate and the House. We are not expecting him to agree on our ideas, but he does owe them a simple up-or-down vote. If he doesn't owe it to us, he certainly owes it to the American people.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman. I love the fact that he talked about Montana and what is going there and the northern route approval, Mr. Speaker, the H.R. 3. I wish he would hold that bill back up.

I will yield to the gentleman. How many pages is actually in that bill that would approve the route for the Keystone pipeline?

Mr. DAINES. I know ObamaCare was over 2,000 pages.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. So it is 2,700 pages.

Mr. DAINES. Here is the H.R. 3, the act to approve the Keystone XL pipeline. It is very simple. In fact, it is two pages and about a third of a bottom of a third page, so call it 2-1/3 pages, and we can approve the Keystone pipeline.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. That is easy to read, and people could easily read that.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note that our bills are not 2,000 pages or 2,700 pages or 2,300 pages. You are talking about bills that are readable. They are easy to work through. You can take them up one at a time, get going on them, and get some things done for the American people.

You can see the different bills. This one is two pages. This one can't be more than about 15 or 20 pages.

□ 2015

So this is not too much of a heavy lift. You can look at a bill like the Keystone pipeline bill, H.R. 3. It is simple and easy to read, but yet this would help create the environment for jobs growth. It would put in motion the components that are necessary to get 42,000 direct and indirect jobs started and on the books.

For an electric power co-op in Montana—and I think it is important to realize that co-ops are membership-led and owned organizations; these are the people that live in the communities that own these utilities—it would be able to hold those utility rates flat.

What a boom that would be for those families that are members of that co-op and those small businesses to be able to say, We have got certainty and stability and we have got security of electric power that is going to be predictable and our rates are going to be stable and low for a 10-year period of time.

That helps them to know what to expect, to work those business plans, and develop plans for expansion. That aids job growth. And that is an indirect benefit. It is a positive consequence of taking a step and passing a bill that is not even 3-pages long that would approve a route for a project.

Mr. DAINES. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. On the issue of the Keystone pipeline and the benefits, many of those ratepayers in Montana are hardworking families that live month to month. Many of them are seniors that are living on fixed incomes. And so this President, by stopping the Keystone pipeline and not approving that bill that is just slightly over 2 pages in length, in essence, he is declaring war on the middle class of America that is struggling to make ends meet month to month.

Our daughter just graduated from Montana State University with a degree in elementary education. She is going to be a teacher. If we can approve the Keystone pipeline, we recognize these tax revenues in the State of Montana, and millions of dollars that will help fund our teachers, our schools, our infrastructure in Montana.

These are other benefits of the Keystone pipeline that we need to talk about that affect more than just the jobs. It also the tax revenues, as we talked about, and keeping the electric rates flat for many, many Montanans that live on fixed incomes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. That is exactly right. And it is about making certain that we get our labor force participation back up in this country. We have the lowest labor force participation rate we have had since the misery index days of Jimmy Carter's Presidency. We would love to see more individuals back into the workforce.

There are 40 bills that would deal with creating the environment for jobs growth to take place. There is opportunity for innovation in some of these bills. There is predictability and certainty in bills as simple as the little bit on the Keystone pipeline. All of it is sitting on HARRY REID's desk.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier tonight, one of the questions many of us in the House are asking is, What is the Senate afraid of? What is it the majority leader and the Senate fearful of? Why does he not take up some of these bills?

We have 332 bills, and 232 passed either unanimously or with a two-thirds vote. That is a pretty amazing record. And in these bills are solutions that the American people are looking for—solutions to jobs, to veterans issues, solutions in certainty for our Nation's economy, for our national security, and opportunity for our children.

Those are the things that our focus is on. It is what our constituents have sent us here to do and the job they have sent us here to do.

So I would encourage my colleagues. And as we move forward, we will continue in the House to do our job and to send bills to the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you I think that we would be encouraging of our friends in the Senate to not be a do-nothing Senate—not to be content with that—but to be aggressive in taking up these bills. And as they get ready for August and go back to their districts to work, to get around to it and get to work to clean and organize their desks and do what is right for the American people by addressing the issues that concern them and finding solutions to the issues that they bring to us each and every day.

With that I yield back the balance of my time.

TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, as always, it is a supreme privilege to be able to stand here in the greatest deliberative body in the world, the well of the United States House of Representatives.

It is a thrill to be able to be here also to be able to stand in defense of our ally, the Jewish State of Israel, which is under attack, even now, as we are here in this Chamber this evening.

As all Americans have seen across the country, the fighting that is going on in the Middle East has been horrific,

but we must remember that all of this began with an unprovoked attack by the terrorist organization named Hamas. Hamas is the governing organization over Gaza.

If a person looks at a map of the Middle East, there is the Mediterranean Sea. Just on the easternmost part of the Mediterranean Sea lies the very tiny Nation of Israel, approximately the size of New Jersey. On the southwest corner of Israel is a little area known as Gaza.

In 2005, Israel willingly gave up the area called Gaza. Why? Because the Palestinians that were in the area known as Gaza were continually attacking and causing havoc against the Jews that lived in the Gaza area.

Jews who had businesses, Jews who had homes, as well as synagogues, relinquished those homes and businesses voluntarily in an effort known as "land for peace." So Israel gave up its land to Palestinians, and the Palestinians promised there would be peace.

At that time, Abu Mazen, also known as Abbas, the head of the now Palestinian Authority, had promised that the Gaza region would remain demilitarized. In other words, that there would be no weaponry and no rockets that would be contained in the Gaza region.

This has been a joke and an absolute lie and a fraud from the Palestinians and from the leader Abbas from the beginning in 2005. How do we know? Almost nearly overnight, the Palestinians in Gaza began firing rockets at Israel. That was 9 years ago, in 2005. Today is 2014. Nothing has changed. As a matter of fact, now we are seeing the rise once again from Gaza of rockets being fired into Israel—again, in an unprovoked attack.

We should also recognize Hamas isn't a stand-alone terrorist organization. Hamas is a part of a wider constellation of terrorist organizations—franchises, you might say—under an umbrella. That umbrella is to my left.

That umbrella is known as the international Muslim Brotherhood. It was begun in 1928 to reconstitute the Islamic caliphate across the world. Again, the umbrella organization is known as the Ikhwan, the international Muslim Brotherhood.

There are various entities, Hamas being one of those terrorist children, you may say, under the umbrella of this international terrorist organization. It contains individuals who were part of forming and putting together the attack on the United States during 9/11, when our Nation was attacked and the Twin Towers came down, led by Mohammed Atta, and also by the tragic hijacking of an airplane that went into the Pentagon.

Also, one of the earliest terrorist attacks against the Twin Towers in 1993 was masterminded by an individual known as Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, now contained at Guantanamo Bay as a detainee for his work in that effort. He also was found guilty for the work he did there.

I am here tonight, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that the United States does have an option of aiding and assisting our ally Israel in this horrific tragedy that the world is seeing unfold right now. And it is this.

As we have seen with this terrorist organization under the auspices of the international Muslim Brotherhood, known as Hamas, Hamas had a very friendly entree when the Muslim Brotherhood was running Egypt, the largest Arab nation in the Middle East region.

The Muslim Brotherhood, under then-President Morsi, had a deal with Hamas; again, the Muslim Brotherhood terrorist organization in Gaza. This was the deal. Hamas was allowed to run smuggling operations through tunnels between Egypt and the Gaza territory. So lucrative was the smuggling business that Hamas was making, it is reported, \$2 billion a month.

When the people of Egypt decided to throw off the violent terrorist regime known as the Muslim Brotherhood, literally tens of millions of Egyptians took to the streets and said to the Muslim Brotherhood, You must go, and to Morsi, You must go, because the Egyptian people wanted to stop the slaughter and murder of innocent people, including the Coptic Christians.

Coptic churches were burned in Egypt. Coptic businesses owned by Coptic Christians were also burned and ransacked. Innocent people like Christians—there are virtually no Jews left in Egypt because they have been run out—and even Muslims considered apostate Muslims were all attacked by the violent terrorists in the Muslim Brotherhood.

As I said, tens of millions of peace-loving Egyptians and Muslims took to the streets and said, We want the violent terrorist organization known as the Muslim Brotherhood to leave Egypt. The Muslim Brotherhood had to leave. They no longer had any consent from the Egyptian people to rule. There was no process of impeachment in Egypt. This was the only avenue left to the Egyptian people.

The Muslim Brotherhood left, and in stepped the military led by General al-Sisi. The Egyptian people then conducted democratic elections and General al-Sisi was elected as the first President of the modern state of Egypt. He is the President now.

He has been engaged in a very serious struggle with the Muslim Brotherhood. He has worked with them. Their violent protests continued. Remarkably, now President al-Sisi has been able to bring down dramatically the level of violence from the Muslim Brotherhood. The streets are far safer today in Egypt than they were before. And it came at a price.

It came at a price of many deaths in Egypt, but now we are seeing more peace. It is because of the work of President al-Sisi on the border with Gaza that we have seen a dramatic decrease in weapons, munitions, and

most particularly, \$2 billion going into Gaza.

How does this frame into what a new alternative solution would be to tamp down this terrorist organization known as Hamas?

□ 2030

The United States Government designated Hamas a terror organization.

Again, let's remember. This is a U.S.-designated terror organization called Hamas, which unilaterally and unprovoked launched thousands of rockets against our ally Israel. Israel did not provoke Hamas. Israel did not send munitions into the Gaza territory. Israel did not fire the first shot against Gaza. It was Hamas that fired the first shot.

Let us not forget that it was Hamas that fired rockets specifically at the greatest number of civilian targets. We even read this last week that Hamas dressed up in Israeli uniforms, IDF uniforms, and went through a tunnel, into Israel, to specifically go to an Israeli kibbutz so that they could slaughter a mass number of innocent Israeli citizens as well as IDF soldiers.

That is what we are dealing with—greater terrorist acts than we have ever seen before.

They are reporting now from Turkey and from other parts in the Middle East region that they are again calling on wiping out the Jewish state—in other words, killing the Jews in the Jewish state and eliminating and annihilating the Jewish State of Israel. This is nothing more than a genocide.

How can we stop this continual slaughter by the terrorist organization known as Hamas?

They were greatly weakened when President al-Sisi did the United States—the world—a favor when they closed those tunnels between Egypt and Hamas. That greatly reduced the income that was coming into this terrorist, corrupt, violent organization under the Muslim Brotherhood umbrella, but it is not enough because, you see, the umbrella is essentially the lifeline economically for the terrorist organization known as Hamas. If you will, the umbrella is the umbilical cord that feeds economically, politically, and with munitions into this violent terrorist organization.

The question then, Mr. Speaker, is: How can we get the Muslim Brotherhood to stop feeding economically to prop up this terrorist organization known as Hamas?

This is how we can do it:

When the United States Government effectively labeled Hamas as a foreign terrorist organization, then any organization or person who tried to offer material support to Hamas was effectively continuing a terrorist enterprise, and, thereby, there would be sanctions, and in fact, there would be convictions that could be brought against those people.

That happened in a charity called the Holy Land Foundation. This charity

was directed by the international Muslim Brotherhood, the umbrella organization. The international Muslim Brotherhood directed the United States' chapter of the Muslim Brotherhood to raise men, raise money, and raise media support for Hamas, the terrorist organization that is now firing rockets unprovoked against Israel.

That charity in the United States was found guilty by a United States Federal court. That happened in 2008. Our Federal Government has already found, through our Department of Justice, that the Muslim Brotherhood has engaged in terrorist activities. We have Federal courts that have also found that the international Muslim Brotherhood, the umbrella organization, has, in fact, engaged in terrorist activities. Also, our FBI Director in 2011, Robert Mueller, said before the committee of which I am privileged to be a part—the House Intelligence Committee—that the international Muslim Brotherhood has engaged in terrorist activities both abroad and in the United States.

Whether it is through entities, like designating Hamas a foreign terrorist organization, or through our Federal courts, where we have found Muslim Brotherhood charities—in this case, the Holy Land Foundation, a Muslim Brotherhood terrorist organization—our government has found members of the international Muslim Brotherhood to be terrorists who are engaging in the material support for terrorist activities. That would include Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, who this night is sitting in Guantanamo Bay, behind bars—where he should be—because his goal was to bring down the Twin Towers in New York City. This was in 1993. We know that the Muslim Brotherhood was successful and brought down the Twin Towers in a horrific display of terrorism on American soil on September 11, 2001.

So, you see, Mr. Speaker, it isn't enough for the United States to cripple Hamas, the foreign terrorist organization, by designating them a foreign terrorist organization. That was a good beginning. What this body can do is to pass a resolution to urge President Obama—who has the power to direct the United States Department of State—to now designate the international Muslim Brotherhood a foreign terrorist organization.

If we want Hamas to collapse—to collapse economically, to collapse politically, to collapse because they are bereft of munitions and weapons—what we must do is designate the international Muslim Brotherhood a foreign terrorist organization because then, you see, it would cripple the international Muslim Brotherhood with various economic sanctions. Also, those who are members of the international Muslim Brotherhood would no longer have the ability to be granted visas by the United States Government to come into the United States.

This is the best action that the United States could take today to ben-

efit our ally Israel as they are being mercilessly attacked by the U.S.-designated foreign terrorist organization known as Hamas. Cut off the head. Cut off the feeder unit to Hamas. Cut it off, and then we will see Hamas collapse. That is what we could do.

Now, President Obama doesn't need the United States Congress to pass this resolution. He doesn't need that. President Obama, on his own this evening, could designate the international Muslim Brotherhood a foreign terrorist organization, and I call upon our President to do exactly that in order to help our ally Israel.

That would send a resounding signal across the world if the United States took that action because, you see, this has already been done by other countries—by Egypt, led by President al-Sisi. They have already designated the international Muslim Brotherhood a terrorist organization. Jordan, our ally and friend, has designated the Muslim Brotherhood a terrorist organization. Saudi Arabia sees the international Muslim Brotherhood as a terrorist organization. The United Arab Emirates sees the international Muslim Brotherhood as a terrorist organization as does the Jewish State of Israel see the international Muslim Brotherhood as a terrorist organization.

If the nations that are most impacted by the terrorist activities of the international Muslim Brotherhood could designate this nefarious organization as such after the Muslim Brotherhood's participation in the greatest horrific act on U.S. soil—September 11, 2001—and if we have designated charities and entities of the Muslim Brotherhood and leaders of the Muslim Brotherhood as terrorists, participating in terrorist activities, why in the world wouldn't the United States join Egypt, Israel, Jordan, the United Arab Emirates, and Saudi Arabia in doing the right thing in designating the international Muslim Brotherhood a terrorist organization?

You see, once we do that to the umbrella organization, then all of the other organizations that are represented therein are also duly impacted by that designation. That is how we bring peace. That is how we bring peace to Israel. That is how we bring peace to this region.

Just a few years ago, the conventional wisdom here in Washington, D.C., was that the Muslim Brotherhood would be a moderating force in the Middle East and bring democracy to the region. We had great hopes that that is who the Muslim Brotherhood would be. That was the face that they tried to present here in Washington. Tunisia removed their Muslim Brotherhood-led governments because they saw that the Muslim Brotherhood wasn't a moderating force. Hardly. It was a violent terrorist force. As I said, other Middle East nations have taken measures to designate the organization as a terrorist group, and these nations banned the activities of the Muslim Brotherhood completely.

Even our British allies have opened an official investigation into the Muslim Brotherhood's activities and connection to violent terrorism. For the past 20 years and in three different administrations, the United States Government has identified and designated branches of the Muslim Brotherhood as terrorist organizations, and its leaders are branded as terrorists. United States Government officials have testified under oath before Congress, here in this building, that the international Muslim Brotherhood has supported terrorism not only here at home but also across the world.

From its earliest days, the Muslim Brotherhood used violence as its strategy. They formed what was called a "secret apparatus"—that is their term—to attack government officials and foreigners in Egypt, even killing two Egyptian Prime Ministers. Richard Clarke was the counterterrorism czar to both Democrat President Bill Clinton and to Republican President George W. Bush. Richard Clarke testified before the Senate Banking Committee in October of 2003 that the common links that are shared by al Qaeda, by the Islamic jihad and by Hamas were "the membership and the ideology of the Muslim Brothers." As was recognized by our own 9/11 Commission Report, virtually every Islamic terrorist group has built its organization on the ideological bedrock the Muslim Brotherhood established—that is astounding—al Qaeda as well as Hamas.

Some have tried to paint al Qaeda as a great enemy of the Muslim Brotherhood, but whatever differences they have are merely tactical, and there are many reports of the groups cooperating together and endorsing their terrorist activities.

In February 1993, the United States House of Representatives Task Force on Terrorism and Unconventional Warfare reported that various branches of the international Muslim Brotherhood regularly took part in terror conferences with al Qaeda, Hamas, Hezbollah, and the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, called the Quds Force. The senior clerical leadership of the Muslim Brotherhood is led by the group's Qatar-based top jurist, Yusuf al-Qaradawi. He issued a fatwa in November of 2004 that authorized the killing of American soldiers and contractors in Iraq while we were conducting that liberation force at that time.

Many of al Qaeda's leaders also came through the Muslim Brotherhood's ranks. Mohamed Atta, as I previously stated, was the ring leader of the 9/11 terrorist attack here in America on our Twin Towers. According to The Washington Post, he was radicalized while he was a part of the Muslim Brotherhood's engineering syndicate in Egypt. It is fair to say that, rather than being opposed to al Qaeda, the Muslim Brotherhood has been an open gateway to al Qaeda.

One of the enduring myths about the Muslim Brotherhood is that the group

has renounced violence. Nothing could be further from the truth. Then how can one explain the Muslim Brotherhood's long-time support for the Palestinian terrorist group, Hamas? In fact, Hamas identifies itself in its 1988 Covenant as the Palestinian branch of the Muslim Brotherhood—in other words, a franchise of the Muslim Brotherhood—in Palestine's own words.

□ 2045

That is a fact that is recognized in the State Department's annual Country Reports on Terrorism. It was President Bill Clinton who designated Hamas a terrorist organization in 1995, and I praised President Bill Clinton for doing that. It was the right thing to do.

Now, President Obama must do the same and also designate the international Muslim Brotherhood a foreign terrorist organization because, you see, Mr. Speaker, it is myopic to look at Hamas, as it rains down thousands of missiles and rockets on our ally, Israel, without considering the Muslim Brotherhood's greater role in the larger context of global jihad.

In fact, our Justice Department, in 2007 and 2008, successfully argued in Federal court that the international Muslim Brotherhood has directed its affiliates here in this country, in the United States, to organize to provide "media, money, and men" to Hamas, a U.S.-designated foreign terrorist organization.

As Federal prosecutors showed during the Holy Land Foundation trial, the largest terrorist financing trial in American history, the Muslim Brotherhood's Palestine Committee raised millions of dollars for Hamas here in the United States.

The judge in the case wrote an opinion that there was "ample evidence" that establishes the association between Muslim Brotherhood groups here in the United States with Hamas. The convictions of the Holy Land Foundation executives have also been held up by our United States Supreme Court, the highest court in the land.

This was one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why the FBI Director, Robert Mueller, testified before Congress in February of 2011 that "elements of the Muslim Brotherhood both here and overseas have supported terrorism."

The U.S. Government has designated branches, charities, and leaders of the Muslim Brotherhood, as I have pictured on this graphic under the umbrella—branches, charities, and leaders of the Muslim Brotherhood.

U.S. Government officials have said, Mr. Speaker, that the Muslim Brotherhood around the world has supported terrorist groups, and the Justice Department has prosecuted elements of the Muslim Brotherhood here in the U.S. for materially supporting terrorism.

It is long overdue to act on what the U.S. Government has already acknowledged. It is time, Mr. Speaker, to designate the Muslim Brotherhood as a terror organization.

I wanted to speak just a little bit, Mr. Speaker, about who some of these people are under the umbrella, if I could have that slide right here.

The umbrella organization, again, is the international Muslim Brotherhood organization. Under that umbrella is an individual known as Khalid Sheikh Mohammed.

Khalid Sheikh Mohammed was the operations chief under al Qaeda. The 9/11 Commission report said that Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, also known as KSM, who is currently detained behind bars in Guantanamo Bay, he was radicalized in the Kuwaiti Muslim Brotherhood—Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, under the Muslim Brotherhood.

Abdullah Azzam is part of the Palestinian Muslim Brotherhood. He is a leader who was the cofounder, both of Hamas and of al Qaeda, also under the international Muslim Brotherhood.

Yusuf al-Qaradawi is the chief jurist of the international Muslim Brotherhood. Some call him the spiritual leader and guide of the Muslim Brotherhood. He has been banned from entering the United States since 1991. He is the first Sunni cleric to endorse suicide bombing.

Then Mohamed Atta, he was the ringleader of the horrific 9/11 attack against the United States of America, the ringleader of bringing down the Twin Towers and also the attack on our Pentagon. He was radicalized in the Muslim Brotherhood-controlled engineering syndicate in Egypt.

Then Hamas, the foreign terrorist organization raining down rockets, even tonight, against our ally, Israel. Hamas is self-identified as the Palestinian branch of the Muslim Brotherhood.

Then the Union of Good, this is a Muslim Brotherhood charity that was led by Yusuf al-Qaradawi. It was designated by our Treasury Department in November of 2008 for Hamas financing.

Osama Bin Laden—no introduction necessary—he is the al Qaeda cofounder who was radicalized by Muslim Brotherhood leaders at the university in Jeddah.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the Muslim Brotherhood has its fingers all over jihad because its mission statement is jihad. It is radical, violent terrorism to achieve its goal of a global caliphate, to have control of all Muslim and all infidels across the globe.

Then Abdul Majeed al-Zindani, he is the head of Yemen's Muslim Brotherhood, al-Islah Party, and he is the mentor of Osama Bin Laden, designated by our Treasury Department in February of 2004.

Ramzi Yousef, he is the convicted leader of the 1993 World Trade Center bombing. He is the nephew of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, also radicalized by Kuwaiti Muslim Brotherhood.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if anyone watching this evening would go to the official Muslim Brotherhood Web site today, they would see that the international Muslim Brotherhood is praising Hamas for the killing going on in Jerusalem and in Israel, even today.

This is why the best thing that the United States of America could do—and I call on President Obama to do it, hopefully, with support from both Democrats and Republicans, this is not a partisan issue—we need to stand with our ally, Israel. We need to stand against radical terrorism.

In order to do that, we need to designate the international Muslim Brotherhood, the umbrella organization, for what it is, a foreign terrorist organization.

Mr. Speaker, I call, again, on President Obama to bring about this designation to bring peace to our world.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CAPITO (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for this afternoon and the balance of the week on account of a family emergency.

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for this afternoon.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 40. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Michael Lynton as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 23, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 1528. To amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 25, 2014, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6575. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Organization; Disclosure to Shareholders; Disclosure to Investors in System-wide and Consolidated Bank Debt Obliga-

tions of the Farm Credit System; Advisory Vote (RIN: 3052-AD00) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6576. A letter from the Acting Chief Information Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the "Department of Defense Next Generation Host-Based Cyber-Security System"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6577. A letter from the Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report pursuant to Pub. L. 106-569; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6578. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Occupational Safety and Health Investigations of Places of Employment; Technical Amendments [Docket No.: CDC-2014-0001; NIOSH-271] (RIN: 0920-AA51) received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6579. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products and Certain Commercial and Industrial Equipment: Test Procedures for Residential and Commercial Water Heaters [Docket No.: EERE-2011-BT-TP-0042] (RIN: 1904-AC53) received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6580. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Furnace Fans [Docket Number: EERE-2010-BT-STD-0011] (RIN: 1904-AC22) received July 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6581. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Lead NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0888; FRL-9913-59-Region 5] received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6582. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0072; FRL-9913-62-OAR] received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6583. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Control of Visible Emissions, Record Keeping and Monitoring [EPA-R01-OAR-2009-0469; A-1-FRL-9910-12-Region 1] received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6584. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Coco alkyl dimethyl amines; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0590; FRL-9911-54] received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6585. A letter from the Chief of Staff, WTB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of the Amateur Service Rules Governing Qualifying Examination Systems and Other Matters; Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's Amateur Service Rules to Give Permanent Credit for Examination Elements Passes; Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's rules to Facilitate use in the Amateur Radio Service of Single Slot Time Division Multiple Access Telephony and Data Emissions; Amendment of the Amateur Service Rules Governing Vanity and Club Station Call Signs [WT Docket No.: 12-283] [RM-11629] [RM-11625] [WT Docket No.: 09-209] received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6586. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund; Universal Service Reform — Mobility Fund ETC Annual Reports and Certifications; Establishing Just and Reasonable Rates for Local Exchange Carriers; Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime [WC Docket No.: 10-90] [WT Docket No.: 10-208] [WC Docket No.: 14-58] [WC Docket No.: 07-135] [CC Docket No.: 01-92] received July 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6587. A letter from the Chief, Broadband Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions [GN Docket No.: 12-268] received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6588. A letter from the Chairperson, National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, transmitting the Eleventh Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Administrative Simplification Provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6589. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Regulatory Treatment of Non-Safety Systems for Passive Advanced Light Water Reactors [NUREG-0800] received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6590. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Senate's Resolution of Advice and Consent to the Treaty with the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation (Treaty Doc. 110-10) activities report; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6591. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Country Reports on Terrorism 2013"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6592. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Dallas, transmitting the 2013 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Dallas, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6593. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Aged Beneficiary Designation Forms received July 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6594. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6595. A letter from the Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the Office's annual report for FY 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6596. A letter from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6597. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Permits and Regulations, Division of Migratory Bird Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Permits; Extension of Expiration Dates for Double-Crested Cormorant Depredation Orders [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2013-0135; FF09M21200-145-FXMB1232099BPP0] (RIN: 1018-Ax82) received July 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6598. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Sierra Nevada Yellow-Legged Frog and Northern Distinct Population Segment of the Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog, and Threatened Species Status for Yosemite Toad [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2012-0100] (RIN: 1018-AZ21) received July 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6599. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's "Major" final rule — Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan Regulations [Docket No.: 130201095-4400-02] (RIN: 0648-BC90) received July 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6600. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Fireworks Displays in Captain of the Port Puget Sound Zone [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0485] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6601. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Aviation Enforcement and Proceedings, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability in Air Travel; Accessibility of Aircraft and Stowage of Wheelchairs [Docket No.: DOT-OST-2011-0098] (RIN: 2105-AD87) received July 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6602. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Annual Filing Season Program (Rev. Proc. 2014-42) received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6603. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's "Major" final rule — Ninety-Day Waiting Period Limitation [TD 9671] (RIN: 1545-BL97) received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3044. A bill to approve the transfer of Yellow Creek Port properties in Iuka, Mississippi (Rept. 113-553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 4156. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow advertisements and solicitations for passenger air transportation to state the base airfare of the transportation, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3846. A bill to provide for the authorization of border, maritime, and transportation security responsibilities and functions in the Department of Homeland Security and the establishment of United States Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-555, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 594. A bill to reauthorize and extend the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research, and Education Amendments of 2008; with amendment (Rept. 113-556). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 669. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life; with an amendment (Rept. 113-557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4250. A bill to amend the Federal, Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. 113-558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4290. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program; with amendment (Rept. 113-559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3846 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 5184. A bill to establish a National Regulatory Budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Com-

mittees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Rules, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.R. 5185. A bill to reauthorize the Young Women's Breast Health Education and Awareness Requires Learning Young Act of 2009; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 5186. A bill to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5187. A bill to clarify the meaning of the term "prevailing party" with regard to the recovery of attorneys' fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 5188. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to require the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to develop a model form for a disclosure notice that shall be used by depository institutions and credit unions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mr. HALL):

H.R. 5189. A bill to ensure consideration of water intensity in the Department of Energy's energy research, development, and demonstration programs to help guarantee efficient, reliable, and sustainable delivery of energy and clean water resources; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MARINO, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 5190. A bill to authorize assistance for Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5191. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for an institution of higher education that has previously filed for bankruptcy to apply for the reinstatement of eligibility for purposes of Federal Pell Grants; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WEBSTER of Florida:

H.R. 5192. A bill to provide for incentives for agencies and the judiciary to increase operating efficiency; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. MCALLISTER, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 5193. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct outreach to veterans regarding the effect of delayed payments by the Veterans Integrated Service Networks and to direct the Secretary to submit to Congress an annual report regarding such delayed payments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BACHMANN (for herself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 5194. A bill to impose sanctions against persons who knowingly provide material support or resources to the Muslim Brotherhood or its affiliates, associated groups, or agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 5195. A bill to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 5196. A bill to reduce waste and implement cost savings and revenue enhancement for the Federal Government; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, House Administration, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 5197. A bill to amend section 214(c)(8) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the data reporting requirements relating to nonimmigrant employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 5198. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an appeal process for designation as qualified census tracts and difficult development areas under the low-income housing credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 5199. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently modify the limitations on the deduction of interest by financial institutions which hold tax-exempt bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. GRAYSON):

H.R. 5200. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to define care coordination, include care coordination as a fully restorative service, and detail the care coordination functions of the Assistant Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SOUTHERLAND:

H.R. 5201. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to exempt agricultural loads traveling on Federal highways if State agri-

cultural regulations are met; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5202. A bill to require notification when personally identifying information is disclosed by a Government agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution calling for urgent international intervention on behalf of Iraqi civilians facing a dire humanitarian crisis and severe persecution in the Nineveh Plain region of Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Res. 682. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding worker protections in Qatar and the 2022 Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) World Cup; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H. Res. 683. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State in Iraq and Levant (ISIL) as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. ENYART, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BASS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. Cárdenas, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. POLIS, Mr.

BARBER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. FUDGE):

H. Res. 684. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative stamp honoring the life of Maya Angelou; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. FARR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. HAHN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. RUIZ):

H. Res. 685. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of Defense should review section 504 of title 10, United States Code, for purposes related to enlisting certain aliens in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H. Res. 686. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2821) to provide tax relief for American workers and businesses, to put workers back on the job while rebuilding and modernizing America, and to provide pathways back to work for Americans looking for jobs; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

278. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 1076 urging the Congress and the President to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

279. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 37 supporting legislation that reauthorizes the Export-Import Bank; to the Committee on Financial Services.

280. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of North Carolina, relative to House Resolution 1261 urging the Congress and the President to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

281. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina, relative to House Resolution 1261 urging the Congress and the President to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

282. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 22 urging the Congress to enact legislation that would establish reasonable deadlines for the prohibition of the testing and marketing of cosmetic products that have been tested on animals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

283. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of North Carolina, relative to House Resolution 1257 urging the Congress to pass legislation to protect the Corolla wild horses of Currituck County; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

284. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1 applying to the Congress to call a constitutional convention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

285. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1 urging the

Congress to call a constitutional convention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

286. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Resolution No. 40 urging the President to take executive action to suspend any further deportations of unauthorized individuals with no serious criminal history; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

287. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 24 urging the timely action by the President and the Congress to stabilize the federal Highway Trust Fund; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

288. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina, relative to House Resolution 1256 honoring the brave men, women, and children who valiantly served our country as Coastwise Merchant Mariners during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 5184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 5185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 5186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States) and clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 5188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 5189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 5190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WEBSTER of Florida:

H.R. 5192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 which provides that "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 5193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BACHMANN:

H.R. 5194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3; and Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 5195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 5196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clauses 5 & 18, of the United States Constitution

These state that:

"Congress shall have power to . . . coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures."

"Congress shall have power to . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida:

H.R. 5197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. GALLEGGO:

H.R. 5198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of Rule XII.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 5199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 5200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. SOUTHERLAND:

H.R. 5201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill. The Congress shall have Power to regulate Com-

merce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment 4.

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 279: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 318: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 411: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 448: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 506: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 543: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 647: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 690: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. Israel, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 708: Mr. LOEBSSACK.

H.R. 769: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 789: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 831: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 851: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1015: Mr. BARBER and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1070: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1263: Mr. CLAY, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1387: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1462: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1527: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1563: Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 1620: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1763: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1812: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2066: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 2101: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2103: Mr. SIREN and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 2224: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 2450: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2529: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2536: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 2540: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 2632: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2673: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 2727: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2847: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 2852: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 2856: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2917: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2957: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 2989: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2992: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 2996: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 2998: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 3123: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 3367: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. REED.

H.R. 3461: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 3486: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 3489: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 3508: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 3538: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 3581: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3680: Mr. BARR, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 3681: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 3698: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 3717: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3722: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 3723: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 3837: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 3854: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3877: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3902: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3963: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3992: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 4060: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 4068: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 4091: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 4136: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 4143: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 4169: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4188: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 4190: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4212: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 4221: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 4234: Mr. COLE and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 4258: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4276: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 4319: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 4351: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 4365: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 4385: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4440: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 4446: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 4447: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 4460: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4510: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 4521: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 4567: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 4574: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4607: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 4612: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 4625: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4628: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 4645: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4678: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 4682: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BARBER, Mr. DEFazio, and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 4707: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 4716: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 4748: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4778: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 4793: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 4816: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4818: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 4855: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 4857: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4874: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4885: Mr. MATHESON and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 4886: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. McNERNEY.
H.R. 4902: Mr. LOESACK, Mr. DEFazio, and Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 4915: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4930: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 4936: Mr. VELA.
H.R. 4952: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 4960: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BARBER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 4966: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4986: Mr. BARR, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 4989: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 5023: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 5026: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 5052: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 5062: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 5065: Mr. McNERNEY and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 5071: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 5078: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. REED, Mrs. ROBY, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 5082: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 5083: Mr. LONG and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 5088: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 5089: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 5095: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BARR, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KIND, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GALLEG0, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 5101: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. CHU, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GRAYSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MORAN, and Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD.
H.R. 5110: Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 5130: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 5137: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 5143: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 5159: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5177: Mr. GALLEG0.
H.J. Res. 119: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. LATHAM.
H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. McDERMOTT.
H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. FINCHER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Res. 281: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mrs. BEATTY.
H. Res. 411: Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 428: Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 536: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. COBLE.
H. Res. 543: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COOK, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H. Res. 558: Mr. ENYART.
H. Res. 587: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 623: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SIRES, Mr. FARR and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H. Res. 665: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H. Res. 667: Mr. LEWIS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H. Res. 675: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H. Res. 679: Mr. RIBBLE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 4098: Mr. CLAY.